A Reply To "The Myth of An Antisemitic Genocide In Muslim Scripture"

By

Omar Suleiman, Nazir Khan & Justin Parrott

Published by
Yaqeen Institute for Islamic Research

Abū Ṭālūt Haytham Āl Sayfaddīn

2nd Edition

Introduction......4
Commentary on claim that chains of transmission need to be reviewed to understand the meaning of a *ḥadīth*.....6
Full text of *ḥadīth* in question.....7
Commentary on entwining the concepts of Racism, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Discrimination and claim that Islām condemns all forms of these concepts.....7
Islām discriminates for Muslims and against non-Muslims in general, in this life and in the Hereafter.....8
Muslim men may not marry non-Muslim women, other than those from amongst the People of the Book.....9
Non-Muslim men may not marry Muslim women.....9
Jizyah may only be accepted from Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians.....10
Meat of slaughtered, permissible animals is permitted only from the People of the Book.....10
A Muslim does not receive the death penalty for killing a non-Muslim.....11
Muslims have specific rights upon each other which non-Muslims do not.....11
No non-Muslim is permitted to enter *Al-Masjid al-Ḥarām*.....11
Commentary on statement: "A story about a supernatural apocalyptic battle between good and evil".....11
Clarification of the extreme weakness of *ḥadīth* referred to by authors relating to miracles which will occur.....12
Extreme weakness of Ismā`īl Ibn Rāfi` Abū Rāfi` 13
Jahālah (unknown state) of Abū `Abdil-Jabbār `Amr Ibn `Abdillāh as-Saybānī.....14
Point regarding Al-Bukhārī's silence about a narrator in his book "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*".....14
Point regarding Ibn Abī Ḥātim's silence about a narrator in his book "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*".....14
The *tafarrud* (isolated narration) of `Amr Ibn `Abdillāh from Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī.....15
Commentary on statement "And it's not actually a battle of one religious group against another!" regarding the *ḥadīth* in question.....15
Commentary on claim that Muslims believe that after `Īsā returns, Christians, Jews, and Muslims will follow him and unite under *tawḥīd* and belief in all the Messengers of Allāh.....15
Commentary on claim that deviant Muslims will follow the Dajjāl and clarification of weakness of *ḥadīth* used to support this claim.....17
The *tafarrud* of Hishām Ibn `Ammār from Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥamzah.....18
*Inqiṭā`* between Al-Awzā`ī and Nāfi`.....18
Commentary on a laughable mistake related to the Arabic language.....19
Commentary on use of *ḥadīth* related to hypocrites following the Dajjāl to support claim that deviant Muslims will follow him.....19
Commentary on claim that the *ḥadīth* in question relates only to a specific cult of 70,000 Jews.....20
Clarification of a dishonest citation attributed to Anwar Shāh al-Kishmīrī used to support claim that Jews who will follow the *Dajjal's* will only be small fraction of their global population.....20
Commentary on claim that most Jews will be righteous people who join Muslims and Christians to fight against the Dajjāl.....21
Commentary on mention of Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād being the teacher of Al-Bukhārī......23
Clarification of false conveyance of meaning of narration regarding the Mahdī and the Jews.....24
Clarification of extreme weakness of narration mentioned regarding the Mahdī and the Jews.....24

Commentary on claim that righteous Jews and Christians would not follow the Dajjāl because he will be a murderous dictator and clarification that this claim contradicts Revelation and history.....27
Commentary on claim that Jews and Christians follow and Abrahamic tradition.....30
Commentary on inaccurate and misleading translation of the word *kāfir*.....33
Clarification of *sharī`ah*-based meaning of word *kāfir*.....33
Commentary on authors' choice to rely upon linguistic meaning of *kāfir* and their choice to not take all meanings into account; only those which served the purpose of the article.....34
Clarification that defining kāfir as "a rejector of truth" is in line with the belief of the deviant group; the *Murji'ah*.....35
Clarification of weakness of narration used by authors with the word "*kāfir*" in place of the word "Jew", in the *ḥadīth* in question.....33
Point related to the authentication of Aḥmad Shākir.....36
Jahālah of Mu'thir Ibn `Afāzah.....37
The *tafarrud* of Mu'thir Ibn `Afāzah from `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd.....37
Other weak narrations containing this phrase.....38
Point related to the authentication of *Al-Hākim* an-Naysābūrī.....41
Commentary on use of *ḥadīth "Here is a Dajjālī…"*.....44
Clarification of authors' mistranslation of the word *Dajjālī*.....45
Clarification of authors' inaccurate citation of this *ḥadīth*.....45
Clarification that this *ḥadīth* is, in fact, fabricated and mention of the eight defects.....45
Weakness of Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād.....46
Weakness of Abū `Umar Ḥammād Ibn Wāqid aṣ-Ṣaffār.....46
The tafarrud of Abū `Umar from Ibn Lahī`ah.....47
Weakness of `Abdullah Ibn Lahī`ah.....47
Jahālah of `Abdul-Wahhāb Ibn Ḥusayn.....49
Weakness of Muḥammad Ibn Thābit Ibn Aslam al-Bunānī.....49
Weakness of Al-Ḥārith Ibn `Abdillāh al-A`war.....50
The tafarrud of Al-Ḥārith Ibn `Abdillāh al-A`war from `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd.....51
Commentary on claim "War is only permitted in defense against aggression or to aid the oppressed" and clarification that it is in contradiction to what all scholars have said.....52
Clarification of weakness of *ḥadīth*: "Donate in charity to people of (all) faiths" and that authors quoted it incorrectly and relied upon a secondary source.....53
Clarification of weakness of *ḥadīth*: "That the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, gave in charity to a family of Jews, so it continues to be given to them.".....56
The weakness of `Abdullāh Ibn Lahī`ah.....56
Clarification that `Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubārak narrating from `Abdullāh Ibn Lahī`ah does not mean it is acceptable.....53
The *tafarrud* of Zuhrah Ibn Ma`bad from Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib.....57
*Inqiṭā`* between Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....57
Commentary on authors' usage of *ḥadīth* of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, standing when the funeral procession of a Jew passed by and clarification that it was not out of respect for the dead person..57
Mention of narrations authors avoided on the topic despite being at a higher level of authenticity than narrations they used elsewhere.....58
Commentary on the weakness of the story of the rabbi Mukhayrīq.....59

Narration #1.....59
Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is matrūk (abandoned).....60
Jahālah of Ṣāliḥ Ibn Ja`far.....62
Inqiṭā` between Muḥammad Ibn Ka`b and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....62
Narration #2.....62
Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is matrūk.....62
There is a dispute regarding `Abdul-Ḥamīd Ibn Ja`far.....62
Inqiṭā` between `Abdullāh Ibn Ka`b Ibn Mālik and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....63
Narration #3.....63
Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is matrūk.....64
Jahālah of Muḥammad Ibn Bishr Ibn Ḥumayd.....64
Jahālah of Bishr Ibn Ḥumayd.....64
Narration #4.....64
Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is matrūk.....65
Jahālah of Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd Ibn Dīnār.....65
Inqiṭā` between Yazīd Ibn `Ubayd and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....65
Nakārah (oddity) in the text of the ḥadīth.....65
Narration #5.....66
Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is matrūk.....66
Jahālah of Ayyūb Ibn Abī Ayyūb.....66
Jahālah of `Uthmān Ibn Waṯhāb.....66
Narration #6.....66
`Abdul-`Azīz Ibn `Imrān is matrūk.....67
Inqiṭā` between Ibn Shihāb and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....68
Nakārah (oddity) in the text of the ḥadīth.....68
Commentary on the differences between the story or Mukhayrīq and today's reality and what the story actually proves.....68
Clarification of a false translation of the verse: "Allāh does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes - from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly.".....69
**Clarification of a blatant mistranslation of the *ḥadīth*: *"Whoever kills a Mu`āhad shall not smell the fragrance of Paradise, though its fragrance is found at a distance of forty years (of traveling)."*.....70
Clarification of weakness of *"Beware, if anyone wrongs a mu`āḥid, diminishes his right, forces him to work beyond his capacity or takes from him anything without his consent, I will be his plaintiff the Day of Resurrection."***.....70
Jahālah of the sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....71
The *tafarrud* of Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym from the numerous sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.....71
There is a dispute about the condition of Abū Ṣakhr al-Madīnī, or Al-Madanī.....71
The *tafarrud* of Abū Ṣakhr al-Madīnī from Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym.....72
Clarification of an Arabic language mistake in the authors' translation of this *ḥadīth*.....73
Conclusion.....74

بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Introduction

I was directed to an article entitled: "The Myth of An Antisemitic Genocide In Muslim Scripture"[1] authored by Omar Suleiman, Nazir Khan and Justin Parrott and published by the Yaqeen Institute for Islamic Research.

I found it to be a reprehensible article due to the following:

- Mistranslation of verses from the *Qur'ān* and *aḥādīth* to the point that the meanings were partially or completely changed
- Reliance upon an abundance of weak and even fabricated *aḥādīth*
- Misleading statements, strawman arguments and non sequiturs used to divert the readers' attention away from the issue at hand
- Mixing categories of words such as racism, discrimination, etc.
- Misquoting scholars or mixing in their own understandings with what the scholars said
- Sufficing with linguistic definitions of words which have different *shar`ī* definitions
- Sufficing with only some, instead of all of the linguistic definitions of a word
- Propagating the definition of *kufr* (disbelief) according to that of the extremist *Murji'ah*
- A general theme of eroding concepts of *Al-Walā' Wal-Barā'* between Muslims and *kuffār*.

This commentary is on the academic claims made and the proofs used in the article. It is not, as will be evident, a discussion on the event being referred to in the *ḥadīth*, nor a commentary on current events, as the *ḥadīth* in question relates to future events and not our current era.

The whole of the original article is included in this commentary. If something did not warrant commentary, it was still included so no claim could be made that anything was taken out of

[1] https://yaqeeninstitute.org/en/nazir-khan/the-myth-of-an-antisemitic-genocide-in-muslim-scripture/
Since writing the original version, the link has now changed to: https://yaqeeninstitute.org/justin-parrott/the-myth-of-an-antisemitic-genocide-in-muslim-scripture/ and it appears that some of the content may have changed. However, the original pdf that is cited in this article can be found here: https://yaqeeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/FINAL-The-Myth-of-An-Antisemitic-Genocide-In-Muslim-Scripture-1.pdf August 9th, 2020. The PDF is saved here: https://archive.org/details/final-the-myth-of-an-antisemitic-genocide-in-muslim-scripture-1-1

context. The original article is coloured blue and the commentary is coloured black. Footnotes from the original article were moved to the body of this article preceded by **Footnote:** and surrounded by [[ ]].

The original article had a word count of 1904 including footnotes and excluding authors' biographies and disclaimer. It was 4.5 pages long, excluding cover page and authors' biographies and disclaimer.

Abū Ṭālūt Haytham Āl Sayfaddīn

The Myth of An Antisemitic Genocide In Muslim Scripture

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Grantor of Mercy

How an apocalyptic tradition played into the hands of anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim hatemongers

A Jordanian cleric visiting Canada recently misleadingly cited a *hadith* without context or explanation, which rightly triggered condemnations from the Muslim community as well as numerous headlines around the world.

A *hadith* is an oral report transmitted from the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, and can be incredibly complex as one needs to evaluate all the chains of transmission of any statement recorded in a given *hadith* in order to arrive at an appropriate conclusion regarding what it is actually about.

This is clearly a misleading statement. It is correct that all the chains of transmission need to be evaluated. However, this evaluation is to verify whether the *ḥadīth* is confirmed from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Once it is confirmed, the chains of narration do not affect what the *ḥadīth* is about. The only effect the chains of transmission have on the meaning is whether there are other explanatory *aḥādīth* that are confirmed or not.

More importantly, this statement is used as a means to distract the reader. Nowhere in this article is the authenticity of this *ḥadīth* called into question. Likewise, nowhere in this article are the chains of transmission reviewed "in order to arrive at an appropriate conclusion regarding what it is actually about." Therefore, mentioning it has nothing to do with what is presented in the article.

It is similar to the following conversation:

Person A: "Consuming bleach will kill you, as it is poison."

Person B: "Determining what is and is not a poison can be incredibly complex as one needs to evaluate the chemical makeup of any given substance and its reaction with the human body in order to arrive at an appropriate conclusion regarding whether it will hurt you."

The conversation would then continue:

Person A: "Do you dispute that bleach is a poison?"

Person B: "No."

Person A: "Then this is a frivolous and unrelated point."

In this case, a single phrase was cited, one describing rocks and trees calling out to Muslims, "There is a Jew behind me, come and kill him."

The full phrasing of the *ḥadīth* in question is:

On the authority of Abū Hurayrah, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"لَا تَقُومُ السَّاعَةُ حَتَّى يُقَاتِلَ الْمُسْلِمُونَ الْيَهُودَ فَيَقْتُلُهُمُ الْمُسْلِمُونَ حَتَّى يَخْتَبِئَ الْيَهُودِيُّ مِنْ وَرَاءِ الْحَجَرِ وَالشَّجَرِ فَيَقُولُ الْحَجَرُ أَوِ الشَّجَرُ: يَا مُسْلِمُ يَا عَبْدَ اللهِ هَذَا يَهُودِيٌّ خَلْفِي فَتَعَالَ فَاقْتُلْهُ إِلَّا الْغَرْقَدَ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْ شَجَرِ الْيَهُودِ."

"The Hour will not arrive until the Muslims will fight against the Jews. The Muslims will kill them until the Jews will hide behind stones and trees. The stone or the tree will say: 'O Muslim; O Slave of Allāh; there is a Jew behind me; come and kill him.' Except for the Ġarqad tree, as it is from the trees of the Jews."[2]

This is not the first time that this particular text has been used to foment anti-Semitic sentiment within the Muslim community.

Muslim leaders and scholars must forcefully denounce such rhetoric and clarify Islam's unequivocal condemnation of all forms of anti-Semitism, racism, discrimination, and xenophobia.

Grouping these four phrases together is problematic, for although they all have common characteristics, they are also quite different.

Racism: A belief or doctrine that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race or determine cultural or individual achievement; the idea that one's own race is superior and has the right to dominate others or that a particular racial group is inferior to the others. Prejudice, discrimination, antagonism, hatred or intolerance directed against someone of a different race based these beliefs.[3]

Xenophobia: Hatred, dislike or fear of or prejudice against strangers or foreigners, or the customs, dress, etc., of people who are strangers or foreign to or culturally different from oneself.[4]

These two concepts are unrestrictedly forbidden in Islām, and do not require any discussion.

---

[2] Collected by Aḥmad (#9,398) and Muslim (#2,922)

[3] dictionary.com/browse/racism; merriam-webster.com/dictionary/racism; en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/racism

[4] dictionary.com/browse/xenophobia; merriam-webster.com/dictionary/xenophobia; en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/xenophobia

Anti-Semitism: Hostility or prejudice toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious, ethnic, or racial group.[5]

Discrimination: i) Making a distinction in favor of or against; or the unjust, prejudiced or prejudicial treatment, consideration of or outlook or action toward a person or thing or different categories of people based on the group, class or category to which that person, people or thing belongs, rather than on individual merit, especially on the grounds of race, age, or sex. ii) An act, practice or instance of discriminating, or of making a distinction categorically rather than individually. iii) Recognizing, understanding or the power of making fine distinctions between one thing and another; discriminating judgment.[6]

As for anti-Semitism, then this is similar to racism and xenophobia, but directed toward Jews in particular.

However, anti-Semitism, as mentioned previously, may be toward Jews as a race, or toward Jews as followers of Judaism.

If it is related to Jews as a race, this is also unconditionally rejected in Islām.

If it relates to followers of Judaism, or discrimination in general, then claiming that Islām rejects the practice of discriminating against followers of Judaism or other non-Muslims is an absurd claim. There are many practices that discriminate against non-Muslims in general, as well as practices that discriminate against non-Muslims in general, while making an exception to Jews, Christians or Zoroastrians when dealing with Jews and Christians as opposed to other non-Muslims.

In general, Muslims and non-Muslims are treated differently in this life and in the Hereafter

Allāh stated:

أَمْ حَسِبَ الَّذِينَ اجْتَرَحُوا السَّيِّئَاتِ أَن نَّجْعَلَهُمْ كَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ سَوَاءً مَّحْيَاهُمْ وَمَمَاتُهُمْ ۚ سَاءَ مَا يَحْكُمُونَ

Or do those who commit evils think We will make them like those who have believed and done righteous deeds - [make them] **equal in their life and their death? Evil is that which they judge.**[7]

---

[5] dictionary.com/browse/anti-semitism; en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/anti-semitism; merriam; webster.com/dictionary/anti-Semitism

[6] dictionary.com/browse/discrimination; merriam-webster.com/dictionary/discrimination; en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/discrimination

[7] *Sūrat al-Jāthiyah*, 21

It is unacceptable for non-Muslim women, other than those from the People of the Book, to marry Muslim men

Allāh stated:

وَلَا تَنكِحُوا الْمُشْرِكَاتِ حَتَّىٰ يُؤْمِنَّ ۚ وَلَأَمَةٌ مُّؤْمِنَةٌ خَيْرٌ مِّن مُّشْرِكَةٍ وَلَوْ أَعْجَبَتْكُمْ ۗ وَلَا تُنكِحُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَتَّىٰ يُؤْمِنُوا ۚ وَلَعَبْدٌ مُّؤْمِنٌ خَيْرٌ مِّن مُّشْرِكٍ وَلَوْ أَعْجَبَكُمْ

And do not marry polytheistic women until they believe. And a believing slave woman is better than a polytheist, even though she might please you. And do not marry polytheistic men [to your women] **until they believe. And a believing slave is better than a polytheist, even though he might please you.**[8]

And He stated:

الْيَوْمَ أُحِلَّ لَكُمُ الطَّيِّبَاتُ ۖ وَطَعَامُ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ حِلٌّ لَّكُمْ وَطَعَامُكُمْ حِلٌّ لَّهُمْ ۖ وَالْمُحْصَنَاتُ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنَاتِ وَالْمُحْصَنَاتُ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ مِن قَبْلِكُمْ إِذَا آتَيْتُمُوهُنَّ أُجُورَهُنَّ مُحْصِنِينَ غَيْرَ مُسَافِحِينَ وَلَا مُتَّخِذِي أَخْدَانٍ

This day [all] **good foods have been made lawful, and the food of those who were given the Scripture is lawful for you and your food is lawful for them. And** [lawful in marriage are] **chaste women from among the believers and chaste women from among those who were given the Scripture before you, when you have given them their due compensation, desiring chastity, not unlawful sexual intercourse or taking** [secret] **lovers.**[9]

It is unacceptable for non-Muslim men to marry Muslim women

Allāh stated:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِذَا جَاءَكُمُ الْمُؤْمِنَاتُ مُهَاجِرَاتٍ فَامْتَحِنُوهُنَّ اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ بِإِيمَانِهِنَّ فَإِنْ عَلِمْتُمُوهُنَّ مُؤْمِنَاتٍ فَلَا تَرْجِعُوهُنَّ إِلَى الْكُفَّارِ لَا هُنَّ حِلٌّ لَّهُمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحِلُّونَ لَهُنَّ

O you who have believed, when the believing women come to you as emigrants, examine them. Allāh is most knowing as to their faith. And if you know them to be believers, then do not return them to the disbelievers; they are not lawful [wives] **for them, nor are they lawful** [husbands] **for them.**[10]

---

[8] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 221
[9] *Sūrat al-Mā'idah*, 5
[10] *Sūrat al-Mumtaḥinah*, 10

And this is a matter about which there is no disagreement, as was mentioned by Ibn `Abdil-Barr (d. 463 H.),[11] Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah (d. 620 H.),[12] Al-Qurṭubī (d. 671 H.),[13] Ibn Juzay (d. 741 H.),[14] Ibn Mufliḥ (d. 884 H.)[15] and others.

Jizyah may be accepted from Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians, to the exclusion of all other religions (According to the strongest opinion)

Allāh stated:

قَاتِلُوا الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللهِ وَلَا بِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَا يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ حَتَّىٰ يُعْطُوا الْجِزْيَةَ عَن يَدٍ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ

Fight those who do not believe in Allāh or in the Last Day and who do not consider unlawful what Allāh and His Messenger have made unlawful and who do not adopt the religion of truth from those who were given the Scripture - [fight] **until they give the _jizyah_ willingly while they are humbled.[16]**

On the authority of Bajālah who said:

فَأَتَانَا كِتَابُ عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ قَبْلَ مَوْتِهِ بِسَنَةٍ فَرِّقُوا بَيْنَ كُلِّ ذِي مَحْرَمٍ مِنْ الْمَجُوسِ. وَلَمْ يَكُنْ عُمَرُ أَخَذَ الْجِزْيَةَ مِنْ الْمَجُوسِ حَتَّى شَهِدَ عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ عَوْفٍ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَخَذَهَا مِنْ مَجُوسِ هَجَرَ.

"Then a letter came to us from `Umar Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb one year before his death, (containing): 'Cancel every marriage contracted among the Zoroastrians between *Maḥrams*.' And `Umar did not take the *jizyah* from the Zoroastrians until `Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn `Awf testified that the Messenger Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, had taken the *jizyah* from the Zoroastrians of Hajar."[17]

The meat of slaughtered, permissible animals is permitted only from the People of the Book

This was mentioned previously in verse 5 from *Sūrat al-Mā'idah*.

---

[11] "*At-Tamhīd Limā Fil-Muwaṭṭa' Min al-Ma`ānī Wal-Asānīd*" by Ibn `Abdil-Barr 12/21
[12] "*Al-Mugnī*" by Ibn Qudāmah 7/155
[13] "*Al-Jāmi` Li-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*" by Al-Qurṭubī 3/72
[14] "*Al-Qawānīn al-Fiqhiyyah*" by Ibn Juzay pg. 131
[15] "*Al-Mubdi` Fī Sharḥ al-Muqni`*" by Ibn Mufliḥ 6/179
[16] *Sūrat at-Tawbah*, 29
[17] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (#222), `Abdur-Razzāq (#19,391), Al-Ḥumaydī (#64), Ibn Abī Shaybah (#32,648), Aḥmad (#1,657), Ad-Dārimī (#2,543), Al-Bukhārī (#3,156), Abū Dāwūd (#3,043), At-Tirmithī (#1,587), An-Nasā'ī (#8,715) and Abū Ya`lā (#860)

A Muslim does not receive the death penalty for killing a non-Muslim

In a *ḥadīth* on the authority of `Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"وَلَا يُقْتَلَ مُسْلِمٌ بِكَافِرٍ."

"And no Muslim is to be killed for (killing) a disbeliever."[18]

Muslims have specific rights upon each other which non-Muslims do not

On the authority of Abū Hurayrah that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"حَقُّ الْمُسْلِمِ عَلَى الْمُسْلِمِ خَمْسٌ: رَدُّ السَّلَامِ وَعِيَادَةُ الْمَرِيضِ وَاتِّبَاعُ الْجَنَائِزِ وَإِجَابَةُ الدَّعْوَةِ وَتَشْمِيتُ الْعَاطِسِ."

"The rights of a Muslim on the Muslims are five: to respond to the Salām, visiting the sick, to follow the funeral processions, to accept an invitation, and to reply to those who sneeze."[19]

No non-Muslim is permitted to enter *Al-Masjid al-Ḥarām*

Allāh stated:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنَّمَا الْمُشْرِكُونَ نَجَسٌ فَلَا يَقْرَبُوا الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ بَعْدَ عَامِهِمْ هَٰذَا

O you who have believed, indeed the polytheists are impure, so let them not approach *Al-Masjid al-Ḥarām* after this year of theirs.[20]

And there are many more examples in which there is discrimination in Islāmic law between Muslims and non-Muslims.

Of course Islamophobes pounced on the opportunity to trigger alarm bells and generate a new wave of propaganda accusing Muslims of genocidal ambitions towards Jews, and to claim that Islam is inherently anti-Semitic and a threat to Western civilization.

Explanation of the misquoted *hadith*

A story about a supernatural apocalyptic battle between good and evil

[18] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (#92), `Abdur-Razzāq (#18,508), Al-Ḥumaydī (#40), Ibn Abī Shaybah (#27,471), Aḥmad (#599), Ad-Dārimī (#2,401), Al-Bukhārī (#111), Ibn Mājah (#2,658), At-Tirmithī (#1,412) and Abū Ya`lā (#451)
[19] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (#2,417), Aḥmad (#8,397), Al-Bukhārī (#1,240) and Muslim (#2,162), Abū Dāwūd (#5,030) and An-Nasā'ī (#9,978)
[20] *Sūrat at-Tawbah*, 28

As an English reader, this phrase comes across as though the authors are attempting to downplay the reality and inevitability of this event; saying the *ḥadīth* is "A story" about something "supernatural." This fits with the general spirit of the article; attempting to reduce the significance of any conflict between Muslims and disbelievers in general. This may not have been what was intended, but as a Muslim born, raised and educated in the West, this is how it sounds.

When we look up different narrations of the *hadith* in question, we find out that the phrase being quoted is actually part of a larger narrative in the genre of eschatology (the part of theology dealing with the end times and the Day of Judgment), describing the return of Jesus and the apocalyptic battle between Jesus and the *Dajjal* (Antichrist). **Footnote:** [[*Fath al-Bari* by Ibn Hajar al-'Aqsalani, *Sharh Sahih Muslim* by al-Nawawi, *Umdatul-Qari* by Badr al-Deen al-'Ayni]]

In this battle that will take place between the armies of Jesus and the *Dajjal*, several miracles are said to occur including that the *Dajjal* will melt when Jesus sees him, and that inanimate rocks and trees will speak and identify soldiers of the *Dajjal* (*Sunan Ibn Majah* 4077).

Ibn Mājah (d. 273 H.) said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ الْمُحَارِبِيُّ عَنْ إِسْمَاعِيلَ بْنِ رَافِعٍ أَبِي رَافِعٍ عَنْ أَبِي زُرْعَةَ السَّيْبَانِيِّ يَحْيَى بْنِ أَبِي عَمْرٍو عَنْ عَمْرِو بْنِ عَبْدِ اللهِ عَنْ أَبِي أُمَامَةَ الْبَاهِلِيِّ قَالَ: "خَطَبَنَا رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ..."

`Alī Ibn Muḥammad told us, saying: `Abdur-Raḥmān al-Muḥāribī told us: On the authority of Ismā`īl Ibn Rāfi` Abī Rāfi`: On the authority of Abū Zur`ah as-Saybānī Yaḥyā Ibn Abī `Amr: On the authority of `Amr Ibn `Abdillāh: On the authority of Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī who said: "The Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, delivered a *Khuṭbah* to us…"[21] The *ḥadīth* is extremely lengthy, so I have sufficed with mentioning the chain of narration.

This *ḥadīth* is extremely *ḍa`īf* (weak). It was rejected by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774 H.),[22] Al-`Athīmābādī (d. 1329 H.),[23] Al-Albānī (d. 1420 H.)[24] and Shu`ayb al-Arna'ūṭ.[25]

And I have not come across any of the early scholars of *ḥadīth* who accepted this narration. In fact, I have only ever come across one person who accepted it – Al-Albānī [26] – but, as has already been seen, he rejected it elsewhere.

There are three clear defects in this chain:

---

[21] Collected by Ibn Mājah (#4,077)
[22] "*Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-`Athīm*" by Ibn Kathīr 2/409
[23] "*`Awn al-Ma`būd `Alā Sharḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*" by Al-`Athīmābādī 11/266
[24] "*Ḍa`īf Sunan Ibn Mājah*" by Al-Albānī pg. 338
[25] "*As-Sunan*" by Ibn Mājah 5/201
[26] "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi aṣ-Ṣagīr Wa Ziyādatih*" by Al-Albānī (#7,875)

The first: Ismā`īl Ibn Rāfi` Abū Rāfi` is extremely *ḍa`īf* (weak).

Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d (d. 230 H.): "He had many *aḥādīth* and he was *ḍa`īf*."[27]

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn (d. 233 H.): "He is *ḍa`īf*."[28] And he said: "He is nothing."[29]

And he (Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn)[30] and Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 H.)[31] also said: "He is *ḍa`īf* in *ḥādīth*."

`Amr Ibn `Alī al-Fallās (d. 249 H.)[32] and Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī (d. 277 H.)[33] said: "*Munkar al-ḥadīth*."[34]

And Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī also called him: "The *ḍa`īf* story teller."[35]

`Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Yūsuf Ibn Kharrāsh (d. 283 H.)[36] and An-Nasā'ī[37] (d. 303 H.) said: "He is *matrūk* (abandoned) regarding *aḥādīth*."[38]

Al-Bazzār (d. 292 H.) said: "He is not a *thiqah* (reliable), nor proof."[39]

Al-`Uqaylī (d. 322 H.) included him in his book of *ḍa`īf* narrators.[40]

Ibn `Adī (d. 365 H.) said: "And all of his *aḥādīth* contain suspicion. However, his *aḥādīth* may be written amongst the *aḥādīth* of the *ḍa`īf* (narrators)."[41]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385 H.) included him in his book of *ḍa`īf* and abandoned narrators.[42]

---

[27] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 5/434
[28] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 486 and "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 2/169
[29] "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dawrī*" 3/62
[30] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 486
[31] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 2/169
[32] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 1/453
[33] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 2/169
[34] *Munkar al-ḥadīth* is a classification given to one who narrates oddities that no one else follows them in narrating. Narrations from such a person are in most cases rejected.
[35] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 2/169
[36] "*Al-Muttafiq Wal-Muftariq*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Bagdādī 1/405 and "*Tārīkh Madīnati Dimashq*" by Ibn `Asākir 8/402
[37] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 16 and "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 1/452
[38] *Matrūk al-ḥadīth* means the person is abandoned in the sense that *aḥādīth* are not accepted from them.
[39] Attributed to him by Ibn Ḥajar in "*Tahthīb at-Tahthīb*" 1/296
[40] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/78
[41] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 1/454
[42] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkūn*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 135

The second: `Amr Ibn `Abdillāh, who is Abū `Abdil-Jabbār as-Saybānī is *majhūl* (unknown).

He was only declared *thiqah* by Al-`Ijlī (d. 261 H.)[43] and Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354 H.).[44]

However, the *tawthīq* (i.e. declaration of reliability) of Al-`Ijlī is overly-lenient. This was mentioned by Ibn al-Wazīr al-Yamānī (d. 840 H.),[45] `Abdur-Raḥmān al-Mu`alimī al-Yamānī (d. 1386 H.),[46] Al-Albānī,[47] Al-Wādi`ī (d. 1422 H.)[48] and Dr. `Abdul-`Alīm al-Bastawī (d. 1437 H.).[49]

Likewise, the *tawthīq* of Ibn Ḥibbān is overly-lenient as well. This was mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī (d. 852 H.),[50] As-Sakhāwī (902 H.)[51] and Al-Mu`allimī al-Yamānī.[52] In general, his practice was to mention narrators in his book "*Ath-Thiqāt*" if no criticism was known in their regard.

Therefore, this *tawthīq* is not sufficient to remove him from the level of a *majhūl* narrator.

Furthermore, Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 H.) mentioned him in "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" without saying anything about him or mentioning what anyone else said about him.[53] This is supports the fact that he is *majhūl*.[54]

Likewise, Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 327 H.) mentioned him in "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" without saying anything about him or mentioning what anyone else said about him.[55] This also is supports the fact that he is *majhūl*.[56]

Lastly, only one narrator is reported to have ever narrated from him (Abū Zur`ah as-Saybānī Yaḥyā Ibn Abī `Amr). This is significant, in that some have stated that two or more reliable narrators are required to narrate from someone in order for that person to no longer be *majhūl*.

---

[43] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/178
[44] "*Ath-Thiqāt*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 5/179
[45] "*Al-`Awāṣim Min al-Qawāṣim*" by Ibn al-Wazīr al-Yamānī 8/27
[46] "*Al-Anwār al-Kāshifah Limā Fī Kitāb Aḍwā' `Alas-Sunnah Min az-Zalal Wat-Taḍlīl Wal-Mujāzafah*" by Al-Mu`allimī al-Yamānī pg. 68
[47] "*Silsilat al-Aḥādīth aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥah*" by Al-Albānī 2/218
[48] "*Al-Muqtaraḥ Fī Ajwibati Ba`ḍi As'ilat al-Muṣṭalaḥ*" by Muqbil Ibn Hādī al-Wādi`ī pg. 46-47
[49] Introduction to "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī pg. 125-131
[50] "*Lisān al-Mīzān*" by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī 1/208
[51] "*Fatḥ al-Mugīth Bi-Sharḥ Alfiyyat al-Ḥadīth*" by Ash-Sakhāwī 1/56
[52] "*Al-Anwār al-Kāshifah Limā Fī Kitāb Aḍwā' `Alas-Sunnah Min az-Zalal Wat-Taḍlīl Wal-Mujāzafah*" by Al-Mu`allimī al-Yamānī pg. 108
[53] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 6/349
[54] "*Bayān al-Wahm Wal-Īhām al-Wāqi`ayn Fī Kitāb al-Aḥkām*" by Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī 2/390
[55] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/244
[56] "*Bayān al-Wahm Wal-Īhām al-Wāqi`ayn Fī Kitāb al-Aḥkām*" by Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī 2/231, 390 and "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*" 1/201 and "*Al-Mugnī Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" 1/7 both by Ath-Thahabī

The third: The *tafarrud* (isolated narration)[57] of `Amr Ibn `Abdillāh from Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī.

None of Abū Umāmah's major companions, such as Khālid Ibn Ma`dān, Muḥammad Ibn Ziyād al-Alhānī, Sulaym Ibn `Āmir, Al-Qāsim Abū `Abdir-Raḥmān, Shuraḥbīl Ibn Muslim or Abū Sallām al-Aswad narrated this *ḥadīth* from him. In fact, out of the dozens of narrators reported to have narrated from him, none narrated this *ḥadīth* from him other than this unknown narrator with almost no *aḥādīth*.

As for the claim some make that there are supporting narrations for this *ḥadīth*, then this is incorrect. The only defect that is addressed in the supporting narrations is that someone took the place of Ismā`īl Ibn Rāfi`. However, those who took his place were also *ḍa`īf*. Furthermore, the narrations do not even contain all the same information in order to be supportive of each other. Lastly, and most importantly, there are other defects in the supposed supporting chains.

This is a story about a battle between two groups of soldiers involved in war, one side of which is clearly unjust; it does not refer to innocent civilians. And it's not actually a battle of one religious group against another!

It is difficult to see how anyone could say the texts do not indicate it is a battle of one religious group against another!

The *ḥadīth* states: *"The Hour will not arrive until the **Muslims** will fight against the **Jews**. The **Muslims** will kill them until the **Jews** will hide behind stones and trees. The stone or the tree will say: 'O **Muslim**; O Slave of Allāh; there is a **Jew** behind me; come and kill him.' Except for the Ġarqad tree, as it is from the trees of the **Jews**."*

As for the claims that it is merely about misguided people, whether Muslim, Jew, Christian or otherwise, then this will be addressed shortly.

As a matter of fact, Muslims believe that all righteous Christians, Jews, and Muslims will be following Jesus after he returns (Qur'an 4:159) united under one creed of monotheism and belief in all of God's messengers.

This is another misleading statement. The Verse being referred to is:

وَإِنْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ إِلا لَيُؤْمِنَنَّ بِهِ قَبْلَ مَوْتِهِ وَيَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ يَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيداً

[57] *Tafarrud* as a defect is when there is a narrator who had many *aḥādīth* and many students, then only one narrator who is not one of his main students narrates something that no one else did. This was a well-known defect according to the earlier scholars of *ḥadīth*, and can be found throughout the books of *`ilal* and *sū'ālāt*, and even specific books were written to clarify many of these narrations, such as "*At-Tafarrud*" by Abū Dāwūd, "*Al-Ġarā'ib Wal-Afrād*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī, "*Al-Mafārīd*" by Abū Ya`lā. Likewise, a great deal of attention was paid to this matter in "*Al-Mu`jam al-Awsaṭ*" and "*Al-Mu`jam aṣ-Ṣagīr*", both by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī, as well as "*Al-Musnad*" by Al-Bazzār and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī.

And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in him before his death. And on the Day of Resurrection he will be against them a witness.[58]

Here, we see that before `Īsā actually dies, all of the People of the Book will believe in him. This is a fact which no Muslim doubts. However, what are the details of this occurrence? In order to understand it, we need to look at in light of other texts of the *sharī`ah* relating to the return of `Īsā.

On the authority of Abū Hurayrah, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"لاَ تَقُومُ السَّاعَةُ حَتَّى يَنْزِلَ فِيكُمُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ حَكَمًا مُقْسِطًا فَيَكْسِرَ الصَّلِيبَ وَيَقْتُلَ الْخِنْزِيرَ وَيَضَعَ الْجِزْيَةَ وَيَفِيضَ الْمَالُ حَتَّى لاَ يَقْبَلَهُ أَحَدٌ."

"The Hour will not be established until the Son of Mary (i.e. `Īsā) descends amongst you as a just ruler. He will break the cross, kill the pigs and abolish the jizyah. Money will be in abundance so that nobody will accept it (as charitable gifts)."[59]

An-Nawawī (d. 676 H.) stated: "The correct view concerning this is that he will not accept it (i.e. the *jizyah*), and he will not accept anything from the disbelievers except Islām. If any of them offer the *jizyah*, that will not stop him from fighting them. Rather, he will not accept anything but Islām or death. This is the view of *Imām* Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī and other scholars, may Allāh, تَعَالَى, have mercy on them. And *Al-Qāḍī* `Iyāḍ, may Allāh have Mercy upon him, mentioned this meaning from some of the scholars, then said: 'And the abundance of wealth here could be from the implementation of the *jizyah*, and it is to apply it to all disbelievers. Meaning, no one would fight him (anymore), so war would lay down its burdens and all people would submit to him; either through Islām or by extending their hand (as an offer of peace), then he would implement the *jizyah* upon them. And these are the words of *Al-Qāḍī* and they are not accepted. And what is correct is what we put forth earlier and it is that its meaning is that he would not accept anything from them other than Islām."[60]

And this was also supported by Ibn Baṭṭāl (d. 449 H.),[61] Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d. 804 H.),[62] Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī,[63] Badr ad-Dīn al-`Aynī (d. 855 H.),[64] Aḥmad Ibn Ismā`īl al-Kawrānī (d. 893 H.),[65] Al-

[58] *Sūrat an-Nisā*, 159
[59] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (#2,416), Al-Ḥumaydī (#1,128), Ibn Abī Shaybah (#37,495), Aḥmad (#7,269), Al-Bukhārī (#2,476) and Muslim (#155), Ibn Mājah (#4,078), At-Tirmithī (#2,233) and Abū Ya`lā (#5,877)
[60] "*Al-Minhāj Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj*" by An-Nawawī 2/190
[61] "*Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Ibn Baṭṭāl 6/605
[62] "*At-Tawḍīḥ Li-Sharḥ al-Jāmi` as-Ṣaḥīḥ*" by Ibn al-Mulaqqin 14/555
[63] "*Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī 6/491
[64] "*`Umdat al-Qārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Badr ad-Dīn al-`Aynī 12/35
[65] "*Al-Kawthar al-Jārī Ilā Riyāḍ Aḥādīth al-Bukhārī*" by Aḥmad Ibn Ismā`īl al-Kawrānī 5/471

Qasṭalānī (d. 923 H.),[66] Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī (d. 926 H.),[67] and even Muḥammad Anwar al-Kishmīrī (d. 1352 H.)[68] - someone the authors seemed to be able to misquote for their own benefit later on in this article.

The statement of the authors presents an understanding that there will be Muslims, Jews and Christians, each remaining part of their religious group, fighting alongside each other. This is not the case. The understanding of the texts as a whole is that they will enter into Islām before he dies.

And in order for there to be Jews – any Jews – this means that they have not believed in `Īsā. Accordingly, we know for a fact that the People of the Book believing in `Īsā before his death is inescapably after the Muslims fight the Dajjāl and his followers. There is no other way to understand it. If we say that they believe in him, then he fights the Dajjāl, we are negating the *ḥadīth* that states that there will be Jews following the Dajjāl. This is regardless of whether we say the number following him is large or small, whether they are a cult or not, or whether they are only from Isfahan or not, as will be claimed by the authors shortly.

Meanwhile, misguided Christians, Jews, and Muslims will be following the *Dajjal*. Indeed, other *hadith* demonstrate that many of the Dajjal's forces will actually be deviant Muslims (*Sunan Ibn Majah* 179). **Footnote:** [[This narration states that he will emerge from the deviant group known as the Khawarij (Sunan Ibn Majah 179)]]

Ibn Mājah said:

حَدَّثَنَا هِشَامُ بْنُ عَمَّارٍ حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ حَمْزَةَ حَدَّثَنَا الْأَوْزَاعِيُّ عَنْ نَافِعٍ عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ: "يَنْشَأُ نَشْءٌ يَقْرَؤونَ الْقُرْآنَ لَا يُجَاوِزُ تَرَاقِيَهُمْ كُلَّمَا خَرَجَ قَرْنٌ قُطِعَ." قَالَ ابْنِ عُمَرَ: سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ: "كُلَّمَا خَرَجَ قَرْنٌ قُطِعَ أَكْثَرَ مِنْ عِشْرِينَ مَرَّةً "حَتَّى يَخْرُجَ فِي عِرَاضِهِمْ الدَّجَّالُ."

Hishām Ibn `Ammār told us: Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥamzah told us: Al-Awzā`ī told us: On the authority of Nāfi`: On the authority of Ibn `Umar: That the Messenger of Allah, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: *"There will emerge people who will recite the Qur'ān but it will not go any deeper than their collarbones. Whenever a group of them appears, it will be cut off."* Ibn `Umar said: "I heard the Messenger of Allah say: *'Whenever a group of them appears, it will be cut off.'* more than twenty times – *'until the Dajjāl emerges from their direction.'"*[69]

[66] "*Irshād as-Sārī Li-Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Al-Qasṭalānī 6/419
[67] "*Minḥat al-Bārī Bi-Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī 5/625
[68] "*Fayḍ al-Bārī `Alā Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Muḥammad Anwar al-Kishmīri 4/404
[69] "*As-Sunan*" by Ibn Mājah (#174)

This narration is *ḍa`īf*. It was weakened by Shaykh Muqbil Ibn Hādī al-Wādi`ī[70] and Dr. Khālid Ibn Maḥmūd al-Ḥāyik.[71]

There are two clear defects in this chain.

The first: The *tafarrud* of Hishām Ibn `Ammār from Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥamzah.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥamzah had dozens of students. Amongst them were major narrators of *ḥadīth*, such as Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Ar-Rabī` Ibn Nāfi`, `Abdullāh Ibn Yūsuf al-Kalā`ī, `Alī Ibn Ḥajar as-Sa`dī, Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq aṣ-Ṣāgānī, Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyā ath-Thuhlī, Musaddad Ibn Musarhad al-Asadī, Al-Mu`allā Ibn Manṣūr, Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī, Yaḥyā Ibn Ḥassān al-Bakrī, Yūnus Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Muslim, Muḥammad Ibn `Abdillāh al-Ḥaḍramī and others.

Despite this, only one narrator narrated this *ḥadīth* from him, to the exclusion of not only his major students, but all of his students in general.

And Hishām Ibn `Ammār is a not a narrator whose *tafarrud* would be acceptable. Abū Dāwūd (d. 275 H.) said: "He narrated more than four hundred *aḥādīth* which had no basis."[72]

The second: There is a break in the chain, as Al-Awzā`ī did not hear from Nāfi`.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn mentioned he did not hear anything from Nāfi`.[73]

Abū Zur`ah ad-Dimashqī (d. 281 H.) said: "In our opinion, there is nothing confirmed from Al-Awzā`ī from Nāfi`. And I heard Abū Mus'hir saying: Ibn Samā`ah told me, saying: Al-Awzā`ī informed us, saying: A man told me, from Nāfi`.'"[74] Meaning, he placed a person between himself and Nāfi`.

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "Al-Walīd Ibn Muslim performs *irsāl* (i.e. narrates *aḥādīth* by removing people from the chains); he narrates *aḥādīth* from Al-Awzā`ī, which Al-Awzā`ī took from *ḍa`īf shaykhs*, (who themselves took) from *shaykhs* whom he Al-Awzā`ī had reached, such as Nāfi`, `Aṭā' and Az-Zuhrī. He then drops the names of the *ḍa`īf* and makes it from Al-Awzā`ī from Nāfi` and from Al-Awzā`ī from `Aṭā' and Az-Zuhrī."[75]

---

[70] "*Aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad Min Dalā'il an-Nubuwwah*" pg. 606-607 and "*Aḥādīth Mu`allah Thāhiruhā aṣ-Ṣiḥḥah*" 1/242 both by Al-Wādi`ī

[71] "*Faṣl al-Maqāl Fī Ḥadīthi Ḥattā Yakhruja Fī Baqiyyatihim ad-Dajjāl*" by Dr. Khālid Ibn Maḥmūd al-Ḥāyik

[72] Attributed to him by Ath-Thahabī in "*Tārīkh al-Islām Wa Wafayāt al-Mashāhīr Wal-A`lām*" 18/526, Ibn al-Mulaqqin in "*Al-Badr al-Munīr Fī Takhrīj al-Aḥādīth Wal-Āthār al-Wāqi`ah Fish-Sharḥ al-Kabīr*" 4/181 and Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī in "*Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" 1/448

[73] Attributed to him by Al-Bayhaqī in "*As-Sunan al-Kubrā*" 3/504, Ibn Rajab in "*Fatḥ al-Bārī Fī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" 9/230 and Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī in "*Tahthīb at-Tahthīb*"11/445

[74] "*Tārīkh Abī Zur`ah ad-Dimashqī*" pg. 723

[75] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkūn*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 415

Meaning, if Al-Awzā`ī narrated from a *ḍa`īf shaykh*, and that *ḍa`īf shaykh* narrated from someone in whose lifetime Al-Awzā`ī lived, Al-Walīd Ibn Muslim would remove the name of that *ḍa`īf shaykh* and say it was from Al-Awzā`ī from that person who lived during his lifetime.

`Amr Ibn Abī Salamah (d. 214 H.) said: "I said to Al-Awzā`ī: 'O Abū `Amr; Al-Ḥasan or a man from Al-Ḥasan?' He said: 'A man from Al-Ḥasan.' I said: 'Nāfi` or a man from Nāfi`?' He said: 'A man from Nāfi`.' I said: '`Amr Ibn Shu`ayb or a man from `Amr Ibn Shu`ayb?' He said: '`Amr Ibn Shu`ayb.'"[76] So, Al-Awzā`ī mentioned that he took from Nāfi` through an intermediary; not directly.

The point being, Al-Awzā`ī lived in the time of Nāfi`, but he did not hear directly from him.

and according to commentaries on Ibn Majah, he will emerge at the head of a great army ("*jaysh al-adheem*") of Khawarij (*Shuruh Sunan Ibn Majah*, edited by Raed Sabri Ibn Abi Ulfah).

This is indicative of a lack of understanding of what constitutes evidence. "…according to commentaries…"? What does that prove?

It is also indicative of an extreme lack of understanding of the basics of the Arabic language. The commentary states: "*Jayshun `Athīm*." Meaning "A great army". "*Jaysh al-`Athīm*" means "The army of the great one."

Another narration (*Sahih Bukhari* 1881) states that he will be joined by the inhabitants of Makkah and Madinah who are *munafiqeen*—those who outwardly claim to be Muslim but whose insincerity in faith will be evident once they join forces with the *Dajjal*.

The *ḥadīth* being referred to is:

On the authority of Anas Ibn Mālik, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"لَيْسَ مِنْ بَلَدٍ إِلَّا سَيَطَؤُهُ الدَّجَّالُ إِلَّا مَكَّةَ وَالمَدِينَةَ لَيْسَ لَهُ مِنْ نِقَابِهَا نَقْبٌ إِلَّا عَلَيْهِ المَلاَئِكَةُ صَافِّينَ يَحْرُسُونَهَا ثُمَّ تَرْجُفُ المَدِينَةُ بِأَهْلِهَا ثَلاَثَ رَجَفَاتٍ فَيُخْرِجُ اللهُ كُلَّ كَافِرٍ وَمُنَافِقٍ."

"There is no city except that the Dajjāl will enter it, except for Makkah and Al-Madīnah. There will be no entrance from amongst its entrances except that there are Angels lined up at it, guarding it. Then Al-Madīnah will shake its people three times, whereupon Allāh will bring out every kāfir (disbeliever) and munāfiq (hypocrite)."[77]

---

[76] "*Tārīkh Abī Zur`ah ad-Dimashqī*" Pg. 265-266

[77] Collected by Ibn Abī Shaybah (#32,428), Aḥmad (#18,975), Al-Bukhārī (#1,881), Muslim (#2,943) and An-Nasā'ī (#4,260)

This *ḥadīth* in no way supports the earlier claim that there will be deviant and/or misguided Muslims amongst the followers of the *Dajjāl*.

It mentions two groups of people: *kuffār* and *munāfiqūn*. Mention of *kuffār* does not support this claim, as they are the opposite of Muslims. As for *munāfiqīn*, then they are those who outwardly display Islām and hide disbelief inwardly.[78] Meaning, *munāfiqīn* are not Muslims. Therefore, this does not support the authors' claim either.

Jews are amongst the good guys in the Muslim apocalypse

The *hadith* describing the soldiers of *Dajjal* who happen to be Jewish are in fact referring to a specific cult of 70 000 that takes *Dajjal* to be their messiah and follows him in his tyrannical actions (*Sahih Muslim* 2944).

The *ḥadīth* being referred to is:

On the authority of Anas Ibn Mālik, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"يَتْبَعُ الدَّجَّالَ مِنْ يَهُودِ أَصْبَهَانَ سَبْعُونَ أَلْفـًا عَلَيْهِمْ الطَّيَالِسَةُ."

"From amongst the Jews of Isfahan; seventy thousand, upon whom are Persian shawls, will follow the Dajjāl."[79]

Despite this *ḥadīth* stating there will be seventy thousand Jews from Isfahan following him, it does not, in any way, prove that they are the only Jews to follow him, just as it does not prove that they are the only people to follow him (see the next claim). All it proves is that from amongst the Jews of Isfahan, 70,000 will follow him.

This is like if someone said: "In my room, there are three books from India." No one would say this means there is nothing else in the room. In fact, no one would even say that there are no other books.

Hadith commentary states that those who will become *Dajjal's* followers will represent only a small fraction of the global population of Jews (*Fayd al-Bari*, Anwar Shah Kashmiri, 4/197).

This is a dishonest citation. What Al-Kishmīrī actually said was: "And these are those whom `Īsā, عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ, descends to fight, excluding the Jews from the rest of the world, and they are those who follow the Dajjāl."

---

[78] "*Ash-Shāfī Fī Sharḥ Musnad ash-Shāfi`ī*" by Abul-Barakāt Ibn al-Athīr 2/159, "*Al-Mu`taṣar Min al-Mukhtaṣar Min Mushkil al-Āthār*" by Al-Malaṭī, 2/319, "*Fatḥ al-Bārī*" by Ibn Ḥajar 12/271, "*Maṭālib Ūlin-Nuhā Fī Sharḥ Ġāyat al-Muntahā*" by Ar-Ruhaybānī 4/650, "*At-Ta`rīfāt al-Fiqhiyyah*" by Al-Barakatī pg. 218 and "*At-Tafsīr al-Munīr*" by Wahbat az-Zuḥaylī 10/31

[79] Collected by Muslim (#2,944)

We see that Al-Kishmīrī made no mention of them being a small fraction of the general population. All he said was that the ones regarding whom this prophecy takes place are the ones who follow the Dajjāl, not those who do not follow him.

Furthermore, he did not say this when discussing the *ḥadīth* of the 70,000. He said it when discussing the *ḥadīth* of the rocks and the trees.

By mentioning the *ḥadīth* of 70,000, then insinuating that Al-Kishmīrī said the "*Dajjal's* followers will represent only a small fraction of the global population of Jews," which he clearly did not say, the authors are attempting to suggest that others held their warped view on this topic.

Interestingly, right after Al-Kishmīrī stated this, he also stated: "Historians have stated that ten of the tribes of the Children of Israel entered Islām, and only two remain, so let their amount be calculated. And know that it is not farfetched that the people of Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj are the people of Russia and Britain. And what is meant by their emergence is their attack, and they emerged numerous times. This is because Tamerlane (i.e. Timur), Genghis Khan and Hulagu were all from Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj." And he went on to say: "As for the barrier (put up by Thul-Qarnayn), then it is leveled today." He then went on to say: "And what is meant by their emergence is nothing other than their emergence in a corrupt manner, and that the barrier is not preventing their emergence today as well."

Here, we see the following absurd claims:

- The barrier put in place to keep Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj at bay is no longer in place

- Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj have emerged already

- Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj have emerged numerous times

- Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj are likely the people of Russia and Britain

- Tamerlane (i.e. Timur), Genghis Khan and Hulagu were all from Ya'jūj and Ma'jūj

The authors only found one reference to back up their claim and it was someone within the last century. It was someone who, at the very least, is unreliable "in the genre of eschatology." Despite this, they weren't even able to correctly refer to what he actually said, and embellished the reference to suit their own needs.

In fact, most Jews will be righteous folk amongst the forces of good uniting with virtuous Christians and Muslims, embracing the message of all the Prophets, and fighting against the *Dajjal*. **Footnote:** [[Fayd al-Bari explains, "This is only about the Jews whom Jesus is fighting against, namely those in the armies of *Dajjal*, not all Jews around the world." In fact, if *Dajjal* is

followed by a cult of seventy thousand wearing green shawls and crowns—as the *hadith* states—this number amounts to less than 0.5% of the global population, a tiny fraction.]]

Absolutely no evidence is presented by the authors to prove that "most Jews will be righteous folk amongst the forces of good uniting with virtuous Christians and Muslims, embracing the message of all the Prophets, and fighting against the *Dajjal*."

The most that is presented is that not all Jews will fight alongside the *Dajjāl*. However, does this prove those not with him are with the Muslims against him? Of course not. With the emergence of any group, there will be those who follow it, those who fight against it, those who are neutral, those who agree but don't act, those who disagree but don't act, and so on.

Claiming "most Jews will be righteous folk amongst the forces of good uniting with virtuous Christians and Muslims, embracing the message of all the Prophets, and fighting against the *Dajjal*" is a claim of the Unseen, as it relates to future events about which we have no proof. And it is a claim about which they have no knowledge. And Allāh said:

وَلا تَقْفُ مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمٌ

And do not pursue that of which you have no knowledge.[80]

So, in response, we suffice with mentioning what Allāh told us to say:

قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Say: "Produce your proof, if you should be truthful."[81]

As for the assertion that it will only be a "tiny fraction" of the Jews being referred to in the *ḥadīth*, then Ibn Hubayrah (d. 560 H.) said: "The meaning is that whoever amongst them is under *thimmah*;[82] then they will nullify the *thimmah* and fight you, so it will be allowed for you to fight them."[83]

So he held it to be general, understanding it to include even those who were under *thimmah*, as the phrasing is general and does not make an exception to certain groups, nor is there any textual evidence outside of this *ḥadīth* to make any exception.

---

[80] *Sūrat al-Isrā'*, 36

[81] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 111

[82] *Thimmah* refers to the protection afforded by Muslims to those from the People of the Book who choose to live in the Islāmic State in exchange for their ceasing hostilities toward Muslims, payment of the *jizyah* and fulfillment of other conditions, all of which can be found in detail in the books of jurisprudence.

[83] "*Al-Ifṣāḥ `An Ma`ānī aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ*" by Ibn Hubayrah 4/51

And Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī said: "This is because this will only happen in the time of `Īsā, عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, as the Muslims will be with him and the Jews will be with the *Dajjāl*."[84] And nearly verbatim from Al-Qasṭalānī.[85]

So, since the text is general, they viewed it as general, and did not make false exceptions as the authors did.

As an aside, though not a *hadith* nor theologically reliable narration of any sort, there is an interesting comment recorded in *Kitab al-Fitan* by Nu'aym ibn Hammad (d.228H), the teacher of Imam al-Bukhari (d. 256H), which states that after al-Mahdi (another Islamic eschatological figure) recovers the Ark of the Covenant, most Jews will join the Muslims except for a few. And in the Rabbinical literature, the staff of Aaron—one of the items in the Ark of the Covenant—will be recovered by the Messiah, as a token of his authority (*Midrash Yelamdenu*).

There are four issues here. The first relates to the statement "…the teacher of Imam al-Bukhari…", the second to the point of mentioning this narration, the third to the conveyance of this narration and the fourth to the authenticity of this narration.

The first: Mentioning that Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād (d. 228 H.) was the teacher of Al-Bukhārī in this manner is problematic.

- He was **a** teacher of Al-Bukhārī, not **the** teacher of Al-Bukhārī.

- In his "*Ṣaḥīḥ*", Al-Bukhārī did not rely upon him for anything related to the *sunnah*. In other words, if he narrated from him, it was in secondary narrations which he already narrated from reliable narrators. Or he would narrate from him if it was a narration from a *Ṣaḥābī*, not from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. And even in this case, he only narrated from him in a few instances, as Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī said: "Al-Bukhārī met him, however, he did not collect anything from him in the "*Ṣaḥīḥ*" except in one or two instances. And he narrated some things from him in *mu`allaq* form."[86]

- By mentioning that a narrator who is at such a weak level is "the teacher of Imam al-Bukhari" without any explanation, the authors open up the door for the ignorant to attack the "*Ṣaḥīḥ*" of Al-Bukhārī, and in turn, attack the *sunnah* of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

---

[84] "*Minḥat al-Bārī Bi-Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī 6/633

[85] "*Irshād as-Sārī Li-Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukharī*" by Al-Qasṭalānī 6/49

[86] "*Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī 1/447. The *mu`allaq* narrations in "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukharī*" are not meant to be at the strict level of authenticity he dictated for his relied upon narrations; rather they are narrations he used in commentary form and may have parts of the chain missing. Some of them are authentic, while others are *ḍa`īf*.

- Mentioning that he was “the teacher of Imam al-Bukhari” is out of place and pointless, as knowing whether he was or was not his teacher serves no purpose in this article, other than the attempt to lend some validity to what the authors are saying.

The second: As the authors stated: “…though not a *hadith* nor theologically reliable narration of any sort, there is an interesting comment…” Then what is the point of mentioning it, other than to try to show similarities between Muslims and Jews?

The third: The conveyance of this comment. The authors chose to say: “…most Jews will join the Muslims except for a few.” What the narration actually says is that most Jews will enter Islām except for a few. There is a huge difference between these two translations. That of the authors gives the impression that most will join the side of the Muslims; in other words, become allies, join forces, etc., while remaining in their state of disbelief. In reality, however, this narration says they will become Muslim; in other words, they will no longer be Jews.

The mentioning of this narration, and even more so, the translation of the authors, fit with the overall theme of the article; the attempt to dissolve the *`Aqīdah* (belief) of *Al-Walā’ Wal-Barā’*.[87]

The fourth: This narration is defective from beginning to end.

Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād said:

حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ الْعَطَّارُ الْبَصْرِيُّ عَنْ سُلَيْمَانَ بْنِ عِيسَى قَالَ: "قَدْ بَلَغَنِي أَنَّهُ عَلَى يَدَيِ الْمَهْدِيِّ يَظْهَرُ تَابُوتُ السَّكِينَةِ مِنْ بُحَيْرَةِ طَبَرِيَّةَ حَتَّى يُحْمَلَ فَيُوضَعَ بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ بِبَيْتِ الْمَقْدِسِ فَإِذَا نَظَرَتْ إِلَيْهِ الْيَهُودُ أَسْلَمَتْ إِلَّا قَلِيلاً مِنْهُمْ. ثُمَّ يَمُوتُ الْمَهْدِيُّ."

Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār al-Baṣrī told us: On the authority of Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā who said: “It has reached me that the Ark of Tranquility will be recovered at the hand of the *Mahdī* from the Sea of Galilee, then carried and placed in front of him in Bayt al-Maqdis. Then when the Jews see it, they will enter *Islām*, except for a small number of them. Then the *Mahdī* will die.”[88]

There are five clear defects in this narration.

[87] *Al-Walā’* refers to having amity towards the believers due to their faith, while *al-Barā’* refers to disassociation from the disbelievers and disavowing their disbelief.
[88] “*Al-Fitan*” by Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād (#1,050)

The first: Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād (the author of "*Al-Fitan*") is *ḍa`īf*, and some accused him of fabricating *aḥādīth*.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "In *ḥadīth* he is nothing. However, he was a person of the *sunnah*."[89] And he and *Imām* Aḥmad said: "He is known in seeking (*aḥādīth*)." Then Yaḥyā criticized him and said: "He narrates from those who are not *thuqāt* (reliable narrators)."[90]

Abū Dāwūd said: "Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād has approximately twenty *ḥadīth* from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which have no basis."[91]

An-Nasā'ī said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[92] And he said: "He is not a reliable narrator."[93] And he said: "He had *tafarrud* of many *aḥādīth* from well-known *Imāms*, so he ended up at the level of those who are not to be used as proof."[94]

Abū `Arūbah al-Ḥarrānī (d. 318 H.) said: "The situation of Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād was dark."[95]

Ibn Yūnus al-Miṣrī (d. 347 H.): "He used to understand the *aḥādīth*. (However) he narrated *munkar* narrations from the *thuqāt*."[96]

Maslamah Ibn al-Qāsim (d. 353 H.) said: "He is *ṣadūq* (a truthful person). And he had many mistakes. And he has *munkar aḥādīth* concerning the *malāḥim* (Final Battles) in which he had *tafarrud* (isolation in narrating)."[97]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He possibly made mistakes and errors."[98] Meaning, more than others, as all narrators will make mistakes from time to time.

Abul-Fatḥ al-Azdī (d. 374 H.) accused him fabricating *Aḥādīth*.[99]

---

[89] "*Tārīkh Baġdād*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Bagdādī 15/419
[90] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 8/251
[91] Attributed to him by Al-Mizzī in "*Tahthīb al-Kamāl Fī Asmā' ar-Rijāl*" 29/475 and Ath-Thahabī in "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*" 4/268 and elsewhere in his books
[92] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 101
[93] "*Tārīkh Baġdād*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Bagādī 15/419
[94] Attributed to him by Al-Mizzī in "*Tahthīb al-Kamāl Fī Asmā' ar-Rijāl*" 29/476, Ath-Thahabī in "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*" 4/268 and elsewhere in his books, Ibn Rajab in "*Jāmi` al-`Ulūmi Wal-Ḥikam*" pg. 825 and Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī in "*Tahthīb at-Tahthīb*" 10/461
[95] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 8/251
[96] "*Tārīkh Ibn Yūnus aṣ-Ṣadafī al-Miṣrī*" 2/245
[97] Attributed to him by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī in "*Tahthīb at-Tahthīb*" 10/462
[98] "*Ath-Thiqāt*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 9/219
[99] Attributed to him by Ath-Thahabī in "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*"4/269

Abū Aḥmad *al-Ḥākim* (d. 378 H.) said: "He possibly contradicted (other narrators) in some of his *aḥādīth*."[100]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "He was an *Imām* in the *sunnah*; he had many errors."[101]

As for why some declared him *thiqah*, then Ibn Rajab (d. 795 H.) said: "And even if a group of *Imāms* considered him *thiqah*, and Al-Bukhārī collected from him, then (this is because) the *Imāms* used to assume the best about him, due to his rigidity upon the *sunnah* and his harshness in refuting the people of desires. And they used to attribute his mistakes to being because he confused some *aḥādīth* with others. Then, when their findings of his *munkar* narrations became many, they judged him to be *ḍa`īf*."[102] He then mentioned a number of the quotes mentioned earlier.

The second: Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār al-Baṣrī is extremely *ḍa`īf*.

Yes, Muḥammad Ibn Muṣaffā Ibn Bahlūl (d. 246 H.) said: "He is a *thiqah*."[103]

However, Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn: "He is nothing." [104] And Muḥammad Ibn `Awf al-Ḥimṣī said: "I heard Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn weakening our companion Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār, and he mentioned that his books burned and that he narrated *munkar aḥādīth*." [105]

Al-Jawzajānī (d. 259 H.) [106] and Al-`Uqaylī[107] said: "*Munkar al-Ḥadīth*."

And Al-`Uqaylī also said: "He is not followed in what he narrates and he is not known for narrating." [108]

And Ibn Ḥibbān: "He was from amongst those who narrated fabricated narrations from well-established narrators, and *mu`ḍal* narrations (i.e. numerous missing people in the chain) from the *Thuqāt*. It is not allowed to use him as proof, nor to narrate from him, except as a means of gleaning lessons for people of this field." [109]

And Ibn `Adī: "He had a book in which there were *aḥādīth* which no one followed him in narrating. His weakness is clear." [110]

---

[100] "*Tārīkh Madīnati Dimashq*" by Ibn `Asākir 62/160
[101] "*Su'ālāt al-Ḥākim Lid-Dāraquṭnī*" pg. 280
[102] "*Jāmi` al-`Ulūmi Wal-Ḥikam*" by Ibn Rajab pg. 825
[103] "*As-Sunan al-Kubrā*" by Al-Bayhaqī 3/394
[104] "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dārimī*" pg. 227 "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/403 and "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 3/123
[105] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 9/152
[106] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn 'Adī 9/16
[107] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/402
[108] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/403
[109] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 3/123
[110] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 9/16

And Ad-Dāraquṭnī: "And he is a *Layyin* (i.e. lacking in strength) *shaykh*; he narrates a great deal from *ḍa`īf* narrators." [111] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf*." [112]

The third: The lack of connection between Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār al-Baṣrī and Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā.

Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā is not listed in any of the books of narrators as one of the *shaykhs* of Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār al-Baṣrī. And in the books of narrators, under any narrator named Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā, there are no students listed named Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd.

The fourth: The condition of Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā.

Since there is no known connection between Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-`Aṭṭār al-Baṣrī and Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā, it is not possible to even verify who Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā is. However, of the narrators named Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā, their conditions range from being unknown, all the way down to those who have been confirmed as fabricators of *aḥādīth*.

The fifth: Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā said: "It has reached me that the ark…"

Sulaymān Ibn `Īsā does not even mention who this statement reached him from.

After all, the *Dajjal* will be a murderous dictator who claims to be God, an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition as well as to all people of conscience.

This statement is indicative of an overwhelming level of ignorance concerning the Revelation of Allāh and of history.

As for the Revelation, Allāh stated:

وَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ كِتَابٌ مِّنْ عِندِ اللهِ مُصَدِّقٌ لِّمَا مَعَهُمْ وَكَانُوا مِن قَبْلُ يَسْتَفْتِحُونَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُم مَّا عَرَفُوا كَفَرُوا بِهِ ۚ فَلَعْنَةُ اللهِ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ

And when there came to them a Book from Allāh confirming that which was with them - although before they used to pray for victory against those who disbelieved - but [then] **when there came to them that which they recognized, they disbelieved in it; so the curse of Allāh will be upon the disbelievers.**[113]

---

[111] "*Ta`līqāt ad-Dāraquṭnī `Alal-Majrūḥīn Li-Ibn Ḥibbān*" pg. 106
[112] "*Su'ālāt as-Sulamī Lid-Dāraquṭnī*" pg. 325
[113] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 89

And He stated:

الَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْرِفُونَهُ كَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ أَبْنَاءهُمْ

Those to whom We gave the Scripture know him as they know their own sons. But indeed, a party of them conceal the truth while they know [it]**.**[114]

And He stated:

الَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْرِفُونَهُ كَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ أَبْنَاءَهُمُ ۘ الَّذِينَ خَسِرُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ فَهُمْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ

Those to whom We have given the Scripture recognize it as they recognize their [own] **sons. Those who will lose themselves** [in the Hereafter] **do not believe.**[115]

Is rejecting a Prophet of Allāh not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"?

Furthermore, Allāh stated:

يُرِيدُونَ أَن يُطْفِؤُواْ نُورَ اللّهِ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَيَأْبَى اللّهُ إِلاَّ أَن يُتِمَّ نُورَهُ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ

They want to extinguish the light of Allāh with their mouths, but Allāh refuses except to perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.[116]

Is the desire to extinguish the Light of Allāh not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"?

Allāh also stated:

وَضُرِبَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الذِّلَّةُ وَالْمَسْكَنَةُ وَبَآؤُوْاْ بِغَضَبٍ مِّنَ اللهِ ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُواْ يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّينَ بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ ذَلِكَ بِمَا عَصَواْ وَّكَانُواْ يَعْتَدُونَ

And they were covered with humiliation and poverty and returned with anger from Allāh [upon them]**. That was because they** [repeatedly] **disbelieved in the signs of Allāh and killed the Prophets without right. That was because they disobeyed and were** [habitually] **transgressing.**[117]

And He stated:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّينَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ وَيَقْتُلُونَ الَّذِينَ يَأْمُرُونَ بِالْقِسْطِ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَبَشِّرْهُم بِعَذَابٍ أَلِيمٍ

---

[114] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 146
[115] *Sūrat al-An`ām*, 20
[116] *Sūrat at-Tawbah*, 32
[117] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 61

Those who disbelieve in the signs of Allāh and kill the Prophets without right and kill those who order justice from among the people - give them tidings of a painful punishment.[118]

Is killing Prophets of Allāh not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"?

Allāh also told the Believers:

أَفَتَطْمَعُونَ أَن يُؤْمِنُواْ لَكُمْ وَقَدْ كَانَ فَرِيقٌ مِّنْهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ كَلاَمَ اللّهِ ثُمَّ يُحَرِّفُونَهُ مِن بَعْدِ مَا عَقَلُوهُ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ

Do you covet [the hope, O believers]**, that they would believe for you while a party of them used to hear the words of Allāh and then distort the *Tawrāt* after they had understood it while they were knowing?**[119]

Is altering the Revelation of Allāh not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"?

And Allāh stated:

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عُزَيْرٌ ابْنُ اللهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللهِ ۖ ذَٰلِكَ قَوْلُهُم بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ ۖ يُضَاهِئُونَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِن قَبْلُ ۚ قَاتَلَهُمُ اللهُ ۚ أَنَّىٰ يُؤْفَكُونَ اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِّن دُونِ اللهِ وَالْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ وَمَا أُمِرُوا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا إِلَٰهًا وَاحِدًا ۖ لَّا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

The Jews say, "`Uzayr is the son of Allāh"; and the Christians say, "The *Masīḥ* is the son of Allāh." That is their statement from their mouths; they imitate the saying of those who disbelieved [before them]**. May Allāh destroy them; how are they deluded? They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allāh, and** [also] **the Messiah, the son of Mary. And they were not commanded except to worship one God; there is no deity except Him. Exalted is He above whatever they associate with Him.**[120]

Is associating partners with Allāh not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"? Is ascribing a son to Him not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"? Is taking others as lords besides Him not "an anathema to all followers of the Abrahamic tradition"?

As for history, then there have almost always been Christians who have killed in the name of Christianity; not merely as individuals, but as armies on behalf of their leaders.

One need not look further than:

- The Crusades

---

[118] *Sūrat Āl `Imrān*, 21
[119] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 75
[120] *Sūrat at-Tawbah*, 29-30

- The colonization of North America by the English and the French
- The colonization of South America by the Spanish and the Portuguese
- The European Wars of Religion
- The Rwandan Genocide

All of these were done in the name of Christianity – an "Abrahamic" tradition – and resulted in the deaths of millions of people.

And currently, one may turn on nearly any news station or go to any news website and see pictures of the occupation of the Muslim land of Palestine to see murders being committed in the name of Judaism.

One may argue that these killings were/are not in line with Judaism and Christianity. However, this is not the issue. The issue is that THEY believed/believe they were/are doing it for their religions. Therefore, to claim that no "righteous" Jew or Christian will be in the army of the Dajjāl is a ridiculous claim.

As for the phrase "Abrahamic tradition," then it is not anything that has come in the Qur'ān or *sunnah*. In fact, it is in clear contradiction to the Revelation of Allāh. Allāh stated:

وَقَالُوا كُونُوا هُوداً أَوْ نَصَارَى تَهْتَدُوا قُلْ بَلْ مِلَّةَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ حَنِيفاً وَمَا كَانَ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَى إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَى وَعِيسَى وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ أَحَدٍ مِنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ فَإِنْ آمَنُوا بِمِثْلِ مَا آمَنْتُمْ بِهِ فَقَدِ اهْتَدَوْا وَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا هُمْ فِي شِقَاقٍ فَسَيَكْفِيكَهُمُ اللهُ وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ صِبْغَةَ اللهِ وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ اللهِ صِبْغَةً وَنَحْنُ لَهُ عَابِدُونَ قُلْ أَتُحَاجُّونَنَا فِي اللهِ وَهُوَ رَبُّنَا وَرَبُّكُمْ وَلَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا وَلَكُمْ أَعْمَالُكُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُخْلِصُونَ أَمْ تَقُولُونَ إِنَّ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطَ كَانُوا هُوداً أَوْ نَصَارَى قُلْ أَأَنْتُمْ أَعْلَمُ أَمِ اللهُ وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنْ كَتَمَ شَهَادَةً عِنْدَهُ مِنَ اللهِ وَمَا اللهُ بِغَافِلٍ عَمَّا تَعْمَلُونَ تِلْكَ أُمَّةٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَلَكُمْ مَا كَسَبْتُمْ وَلَا تُسْأَلُونَ عَمَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

They say, "Be Jews or Christians [so] **you will be guided." Say, "Rather,** [we follow] **the religion of Ibrāhīm, inclining toward truth, and he was not of the polytheists." Say,** [O believers]**, "We have believed in Allāh and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Ibrāhīm and Ismā`īl and Isḥāq and Ya`qūb and the Descendants and what was given to Mūsā and `Īsā and what was given to the Prophets from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and we are *Muslims*** [in submission] **to Him." So if they believe in the same as you believe in, then they have been** [rightly] **guided; but if they turn away, they are only in dissension, and Allāh will be sufficient for you against them. And He is the Hearing, the Knowing.** [And say,

"Ours is] **the religion of Allāh. And who is better than Allāh in** [ordaining] **religion? And we are worshippers of Him." Say,** [O Muḥammad]**, "Do you argue with us about Allāh while He is our Lord and your Lord? For us are our deeds, and for you are your deeds. And we are sincere** [in deed and intention] **to Him." Or do you say that Ibrāhīm and Ismā`īl and Isḥāq and Ya`qūb and the Descendants were Jews or Christians? Say, "Are you more knowing or is Allāh?" And who is more unjust than one who conceals a testimony he has from Allāh? And Allāh is not unaware of what you do. That is a nation which has passed on. It will have** [the consequence of] **what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.**[121]

And He stated:

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ ۚ فَإِن تَوَلَّوْا فَقُولُوا اشْهَدُوا بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تُحَاجُّونَ فِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَمَا أُنزِلَتِ التَّوْرَاةُ وَالْإِنجِيلُ إِلَّا مِن بَعْدِهِ ۚ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ هَا أَنتُمْ هَٰؤُلَاءِ حَاجَجْتُمْ فِيمَا لَكُم بِهِ عِلْمٌ فَلِمَ تُحَاجُّونَ فِيمَا لَيْسَ لَكُم بِهِ عِلْمٌ ۚ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ وَأَنتُمْ لَا تَعْلَمُونَ مَا كَانَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ يَهُودِيًّا وَلَا نَصْرَانِيًّا وَلَٰكِن كَانَ حَنِيفًا مُّسْلِمًا وَمَا كَانَ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ إِنَّ أَوْلَى النَّاسِ بِإِبْرَاهِيمَ لَلَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُ وَهَٰذَا النَّبِيُّ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ۗ وَاللَّهُ وَلِيُّ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَدَّت طَّائِفَةٌ مِّنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ لَوْ يُضِلُّونَكُمْ وَمَا يُضِلُّونَ إِلَّا أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَا يَشْعُرُونَ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَأَنتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ

Say, "O People of the Scripture, come to a word that is equitable between us and you - that we will not worship except Allāh and not associate anything with Him and not take one another as lords instead of Allāh." But if they turn away, then say, "Bear witness that we are *Muslims* [submitting to Him]**." O People of the Scripture, why do you argue about Ibrāhīm while the *Tawrāt* and the *Injīl* were not revealed until after him? Then will you not reason? Here you are - those who have argued about that of which you have** [some] **knowledge, but why do you argue about that of which you have no knowledge? And Allāh knows, while you know not. Ibrāhīm was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was one inclining toward truth, a *Muslim*. And he was not of the polytheists. Indeed, the most worthy of Ibrāhīm among the people are those who followed him** [in submission to Allāh] **and this Prophet, and those who believe** [in his message]**. And Allāh is the ally of the believers. A faction of the people of the Scripture wish they could mislead you. But they do not mislead except themselves, and they perceive** [it] **not. O People of the Scripture, why do you disbelieve in the verses of Allāh while you witness** [to their truth]**?**[122]

Therefore, the Jews and Christians have no actual tie to Ibrāhīm.

---

[121] *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, 135-141
[122] *Sūrat Āl `Imrān*, 64-70

One may ask: “Isn’t attributing one’s self to Ibrāhīm enough to say one is following an ‘Abrahamic tradition’?”

No it is not. If this was true, then the *mushrikīn* of Quraysh would also be followers of an “Abrahamic tradition,” as they used to consider themselves followers of Ibrāhīm.

Asmā’ Bint Abī Bakr said:

"رَأَيْتُ زَيْدَ بْنَ عَمْرِو بْنِ نُفَيْلٍ قَائِمـًا مُسْنِداً ظَهْرَهُ إِلَى الْكَعْبَةِ يَقُولُ: يَا مَعَاشِرَ قُرَيْشٍ وَاللهِ مَا مِنْكُمْ عَلَى دِينِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ غَيْرِي."

“I saw Zayd Ibn `Amr Ibn Nufayl standing with his back against the *Ka`bah* saying: ‘O people of Quraysh; by Allāh, none amongst you is on the religion of Ibrāhīm except me.’”[123]

The authors may claim that they did not say *Millah*, *Dīn*, religion or faith of Ibrāhīm, but merely tradition. Although this is true in this paragraph, we will see shortly that they say: “All three Abrahamic faiths (Islam, Christianity, and Judaism)…”

Muslims do not believe that rocks and trees will be pointing out random innocent bystanders, but rather soldiers of the *Dajjal*—combatants who are themselves involved in killing innocent people. It is about these specific combatants in the Antichrist’s army that rocks and trees will say, “There is one hiding behind me, come and slay him!”

No *ḥadīth* says: “There is one hiding behind me…” The confirmed *ḥadīth* says: *“There is a Jew behind me…”*, a *ḍa`īf ḥadīth* says: *“There is a kāfir behind me…”* and a fabricated *ḥadīth* says: *“This is a Dajjālī…”*

This is another example of the article attempting to erode the concept of *Al-Walā’ Wal-Barā’* by removing phrases which directly differentiate between Muslims and disbelievers.

The religious identity of the *Dajjal’s* soldiers includes evildoers from all backgrounds (including misguided Muslims).

No it does not, as will be explained.

Other variants of the *hadith* state that the rocks and trees will simply say, “Here is a rejector of truth hiding behind me!” (*Musnad Ahmad* 3546)

There are three problems here:

[123] Collected by Al-Bukhārī in *mu`allaq* form (#3,828)

The first relates to the translation of the *ḥadīth* provided by the authors, the second relates to the deviant belief that is supported by the translation, and the third relates to the authenticity of the *ḥadīth*.

Firstly: The translation of the *ḥadīth* is inaccurate and frankly, misleading. The *ḥadīth* states:

"حَتَّى إِنَّ الْحَجَرَ وَالشَّجَرَ لَيَقُولُ يَا مُسْلِمُ إِنَّ تَحْتِي كَافِراً فَتَعَالَ فَاقْتُلْهُ."

"To the point that rocks and trees will say: 'O Muslim; there is a kāfir (disbeliever) beneath me, so come kill him.'"[124]

In *shar`ī* terms, the word *kāfir* is the opposite of the words Muslim or *Mu'min* (Believer), depending on the text.

Allāh stated:

وَقُلِ الْحَقُّ مِن رَّبِّكُمْ ۖ فَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيُؤْمِن وَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيَكْفُرْ

And say, "The truth is from your Lord, so whoever wills - let him believe; and whoever wills - let him disbelieve."[125]

And He stated:

هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ فَمِنكُمْ كَافِرٌ وَمِنكُم مُّؤْمِنٌ

It is He who created you, then among you is the disbeliever, and among you is the believer.[126]

And on the authority of Usāmah Ibn Zayd that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"لَا يَرِثُ الْمُسْلِمُ الْكَافِرَ وَلَا الْكَافِرُ الْمُسْلِمَ."

"The Muslim does not inherit from the kāfir nor the kāfir from the Muslim."[127]

And with the phrase:

"لاَ يَرِثُ المُؤْمِنُ الكَافِرَ وَلاَ يَرِثُ الكَافِرُ المُؤْمِنَ."

"The mu'min does not inherit from the kāfir and the kāfir does not inherit from the mu'min."[128]

---

[124] Collected by Aḥmad (#3,556)
[125] *Sūrat al-Kahf*, 29
[126] *Sūrat at-Tagābun*, 2
[127] Collected by `Abdur-Razzāq (#9,852), Al-Ḥumaydī (#551), Aḥmad (#21,813), Ad-Dārimī (#3,044), Al-Bukhārī (#6,764) and Muslim (#1,614), Ibn Mājah (#2,730), Abū Dāwūd (#2,909), At-Tirmithī (#2,107) and An-Nasā'ī (#6,343)
[128] Collected by Al-Bukhārī (#4,283)

And on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"النَّاسُ تَبَعٌ لِقُرَيْشٍ فِي هَذَا الشَّأْنِ مُسْلِمُهُمْ تَبَعٌ لِمُسْلِمِهِمْ وَكَافِرُهُمْ تَبَعٌ لِكَافِرِهِمْ."

"The tribe of Quraysh has precedence over the people in this connection (i.e. the right of ruling). The Muslim follows the Muslim amongst them, and the kāfir follows the kāfir amongst them."[129]

We see that "*kāfir*" is the opposite of "Muslim" or "*Mu'min*".

Even in the *ḥadīth* quoted by the authors, its states: "…*'O Muslim; there is a kāfir (disbeliever) beneath me…'"*

Additionally, in their translation, the authors did not use the *shar`ī* meaning of *kāfir*. Instead, they relied upon linguistics. This is problematic for a number of reasons.

- The *shar`ī* meaning of a *kāfir*, although undoubtedly related to the linguistic meaning, is more comprehensive. This is no different than many other *shar`ī* definitions, such as *ṣalāt*, *zakāt*, *ṣiyām*, *ḥajj* and so on. Despite these ties, one cannot use these linguistic origins in place of the meanings given in the *shar`īah*. If someone supplicated to Allāh five times a day instead of performing the five known daily payers consisting of standing, *rukū`*, *sujūd*, etc. this would not be acceptable, despite the fact that there is a connection between the *shar`ī* definition of *ṣalāt* and the linguistic one, which is synonymous with supplication (*du`ā'*). The same can be said with *zakāt*, *ṣiyām*, *ḥajj* and so on. In this situation, although the linguistic meaning of *kāfir* (rejector) does relate to the *shar`ī* meaning, it is unacceptable to substitute it in place of the *shar`ī* meaning.

- Although rejection is one of the linguistic meanings of *kufr*, and therefore, a *kāfir* is someone committing *kufr*, so they would be a rejector, this is not the only linguistic meaning of *kufr*/*kāfir*. Another meaning is to cover something or someone who covers something. Due to this, a farmer may linguistically be called a *kāfir* due to him covering seeds with soil. Likewise, the night is called a *kāfir*, due to it covering everything with darkness. So, why did the authors only pick one meaning – rejection – and not use the other? To be true to their approach, they should have said: "There is a rejector or someone who covers something behind me."

- The linguistic meaning related to rejection is not restricted to rejecting the truth. It also includes rejecting someone's favours toward you (i.e. being ungrateful). So, why did the authors only pick one type of rejection, after only picking one linguistic meaning to apply? To be true to their approach, they should have said: "There is a rejector of something behind me."

[129] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (#2,502), Al-Ḥumaydī (#1,074), Aḥmad (#7,306), Al-Bukhārī (#3,495) Muslim (#1,818) and Abū Ya`lā (#6,264)

- If we were to agree that what was meant was the linguistic meaning, and that it was only the meaning the authors chose to apply (i.e. rejection), and that it was only the type of rejection that the authors chose to apply (i.e. rejection of the truth); what truth are they talking about? Is anyone who rejected any truth in their life "a rejector of truth"? If so, this means that they will all follow the Dajjāl. If not, what is the criteria for deciding what "truth" is meant here?

- By not accepting the religion of Islām, the disbelievers have rejected the ultimate truth in this life. Therefore, regardless of how one looks at it, these people are not excluded from this *ḥadīth* at any level.

Secondly: Defining a *kāfir* as a rejector of truth means that *kufr* is rejection of truth. And if *kufr* is the rejection of the truth, then this means that it's opposite – *īmān* – is merely the acceptance of truth. This implication is unavoidable, according to the choice of terminology used by these authors. This is the belief of the deviant group; the *Murji'ah*, and one can find discussions and/or refutations of the falseness of this belief in:

- "*Kitāb al-Īmān Wa Ma`ālimihi Wa Sunanihi Wa Istikmālihi Wa Darajātih*" by Abū `Ubayd al-Qāsim Ibn Sallām (d. 224 H.)[130]

- "*Al-Īmān*" by Ibn Abī Shaybah (d. 235 H.)[131]

- "*As-Sunnah*" by Ibn Abī `Āṣim (d. 287 H.)[132]

- "*As-Sunnah*" by Abū Bakr al-Khallāl al-Ḥanbalī (d. 311 H.)[133]

- "*Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*" by Abul-Ḥasan al-Ash`arī (d. 324 H.)[134]

- "*Al-Ibānah `An Sharī`at al-Firqat an-Nājiyah Wa Mujānabat al-Firaq al-Mathmūmah*" by Ibn Baṭṭah al-Ḥanbalī (d. 387 H.)[135]

- "*Sharḥ Uṣūl I`tiqād Ahl as-Sunnah Wal-Jamā`ah Min al-Kitāb Was-Sunnah Wa Ijmā` aṣ-Ṣaḥābah Wat-Tābi`īn Min Ba`dihim*" by Al-Lālakā'ī ash-Shāfi`ī (d. 418 H.)[136]

- "*Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq*" by `Abdul-Qāhir al-Baġdādī (d. 429 H.)[137]

---

[130] pg. 9-103 (the whole book)
[131] pg. 16-50 (the whole book)
[132] pg. 461-465
[133] 1/562-602 and 2/9-60
[134] 1/213-224
[135] 1/625-906
[136] 2/809 - 3/1032
[137] pg. 178-182

- "*Al-Milal Wan-Niḥal*" by Ash-Shahrastānī (d. 548 H.)[138]

Thirdly: As for the authenticity of this *ḥadīth*, then it is *ḍa`īf*. It was declared *ḍa`īf* by Al-Albānī[139] and Shu`ayb al-Arna'ūṭ.[140]

The chain of transmission for this *ḥadīth* is:

Imām Aḥmad said:

حَدَّثَنَا هُشَيْمٌ أَنْبَأَنَا الْعَوَّامُ عَنْ جَبَلَةَ بْنِ سُحَيْمٍ عَنْ مُؤْثِرِ بْنِ عَفَازَةَ عَنْ ابْنِ مَسْعُودٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ...

Hushaym told us: Al-`Awwām conveyed to us: On the authority of Jabalah Ibn Suḥaym: On the authority of Mu'thir Ibn `Afāzah: On the authority of Ibn Mas`ūd: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ...

And Ibn Jarīr (d. 310 H.) said:

حَدَّثَنِي أَحْمَدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ قَالَ: ثَنَا هُشَيْمُ بْنُ بَشِيرٍ...

Aḥmad Ibn Ibrāhīm told me, saying: Hushaym Ibn Bashīr told us...[141]

And he said:

حَدَّثَنِي عُبَيْدُ بْنُ إِسْمَاعِيلَ الْهَبَّارِيُّ قَالَ: ثَنَا الْمُحَارِبِي: عَنْ أَصْبَغَ بْنِ زَيْدٍ: عَنِ الْعَوَّامِ بْنِ حَوْشَبٍ...

`Ubayd Ibn Ismā`īl al-Habbārī told me, saying: Al-Muḥāribī told us: On the authority of Aṣbaġ Ibn Zayd: On the authority of Al-`Awwām Ibn Ḥawshab...[142]

And Ash-Shāshī (d. 335 H.) said:

حَدَّثَنَا عِيسَى بْنُ أَحْمَدَ: حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ مُطِيعٍ: نا هُشَيْمٌ...

`Īsā Ibn Aḥmad told us: `Abdullāh Ibn Mutī` told me: Hushaym informed us...[143]

Yes, it was declared *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) by Aḥmad Shākir (d. 1377 H.).[144] However, he is known for being overly-lenient with his authentication.

---

[138] 1/137-144
[139] "*Silsilat al-Aḥādīth aḍ-Ḍa`īfah Wal-Mawḍū`ah*" by Al-Albānī 9/307
[140] "*Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad*" with the verification of Shu`ayb al-Arna'ūṭ, `Ādil Murshid and others 6/20
[141] Collected by Ibn Jarīr in "*Jāmi` al-Bayān `An Ta'wīl Āy al-Qur'ān*" 15/413 and 16/406
[142] Collected by Ibn Jarīr in "*Jāmi` al-Bayān `An Ta'wīl Āy al-Qur'ān*" 16/406
[143] Collected by Ash-Shāshī in "*Al-Musnad*" (#846)
[144] "*Al-Musnad*" by *Imām* Aḥmad 3/485

This was mentioned by `Abdul-`Azīz Ibn Bāz (d. 1420 H.),[145] Al-Albānī,[146] `Abdullāh as-Sa`d,[147] Abū Isḥāq al-Ḥuwaynī,[148] `Abdul-Karīm al-Khuḍayr,[149] Muṣṭafā al-`Adawī[150] and others.

There are two clear defects in this chain.

The first: Mu'thir Ibn `Afāzah is the *majhūl*.

He was only declared trustworthy by Al-`Ijlī[151] and Ibn Ḥibbān.[152]

Despite this, he is at the level of *majhūl*. This is because:

- The *tawthīq* of Al-`Ijlī is overly-lenient, as was mentioned earlier.

- Ibn Ḥibbān is overly-lenient as well and his practice was to mention narrators in his book "*Ath-Thiqāt*" if no criticism was known in their regard, as was mentioned earlier.

- Al-Bukhārī mentioned him in "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*"[153] without declaring anything about him or mentioning what anyone else declared about him. And this is indicative of him being *majhūl*, as was mentioned earlier.

- Ibn Abī Ḥātim mentioned him in "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*"[154] without declaring anything about him or mentioning what anyone else declared about him. And this is indicative of him being *majhūl*, as was mentioned earlier.

- Only one narrator is known to have ever narrated from him (Jabalah Ibn Suḥaym).

- He is only known to have ever narrated two *aḥādīth*.

The second: The *tafarrud* of Mu'thir Ibn `Afāzah from `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd.

None of `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd's major companions, such as `Alqamah Ibn Qays, Masrūq Ibn al-Ajda`, Al-Aswad Ibn Yazīd, `Abīdah as-Salmānī, Abū Wā'il Shaqīq Ibn Salamah or `Amr Ibn Shuraḥbīl narrated this *ḥadīth* from him. In fact, out of the hundreds of narrators reported to

---

[145] "*Majmū` Fatāwā* Ibn Bāz" 26/258-259
[146] "*Silsilat al-Aḥādīth as-Ṣaḥīḥah*" by Al-Albānī 7/357
[147] "*Al-Lāmi` Fī Sharḥ as-Sa`d `Alal-Jāmi`*" pg. 327
[148] "*Ġawth al-Makdūd Bi-Takhrīj Muntaqā Ibn al-Jārūd*" by Abū Isḥāq al-Ḥuwaynī 1/89
[149] http://shkhudheir.com/pearls-of-benefits/763470208
[150] "*Sharḥ `Ilal al-Ḥadīth Ma` As'ilah Wa Ajwibah Fī Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*" by Muṣṭafā al-`Adawī pg. 68
[151] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/303
[152] "*Ath-Thiqāt*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 5/463
[153] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 8/63
[154] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/429

have narrated from him, none narrated this *ḥadīth* from him other than this unknown narrator with almost no *aḥādīth*.

And this phrase appears in another *ḥadīth* on the authority of `Uthmān Ibn Abil-`Āṣ

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said:

حَدَّثَنَا يَزِيدُ بْنُ هَارُونَ: حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ: عَنْ عَلِيِّ بْنِ زَيْدٍ: عَنْ أَبِي نَضْرَةَ: قَالَ: أَتَيْنَا عُثْمَانَ بْنَ أَبِي الْعَاصِ..."حَتَّى إِنَّ الشَّجَرَةَ لَتَقُولُ: يَا مُؤْمِنُ هَذَا كَافِرٌ. وَيَقُولُ الْحَجَرُ: يَا مُؤْمِنُ هَذَا كَافِرٌ."

Yazīd Ibn Hārūn told us: Ḥammād Ibn Salamah told us: On the authority of `Alī Ibn Zayd: On the authority of Abū Naḍrah who said: We came to `Uthmān Ibn Abil-`Āṣ…*"To the point that trees will say: 'O mu'min, this is a kāfir.' And rocks will say: 'O mu'min, this is a kāfir.'"*[155]

And Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (d. 360 H.) said:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو خَلِيفَةَ الْفَضْلُ بْنُ الْحُبَابِ: ثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللهِ الْخُزَاعِيُّ: ثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ سَلَمَةَ...

Abū Khalīfah Al-Faḍl Ibn al-Ḥubāb told us: Muḥammad Ibn `Abdillāh al-Khuzā`ī told us: Ḥammād Ibn Salamah told us…[156]

This *ḥadīth* is *ḍa`īf*, as it contains `Alī Ibn Zayd.

Shu`bah Ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160 H.) said: "And he was one who would raise *aḥādīth* (to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, mistakenly)."[157]

Wuhayb Ibn Khālid (d. 165 H.) weakened him.[158]

Ḥammād Ibn Zayd (d. 179 H.) said: "`Alī Ibn Zayd used to narrate a *ḥadīth*, then someone would come to him the next day and he would narrate it as though it was a different *ḥadīth*."[159] And he said: "And he used to reverse *aḥādīth*."[160]

Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said: "And he had many *aḥādīth*. And there is weakness in him, and he may not be used as proof."[161]

---

[155] Collected by Aḥmad (#17,900)
[156] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī "*Al-Mu`jam al-Kabīr*" (#8,392)
[157] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/186, "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/334 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/229
[158] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/333-334
[159] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/229 and with a similar phrasing in "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/186
[160] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/229
[161] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 7/252

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He was not very strong."[162] And he said: "Indeed, `Alī was not a *ḥāfith* (i.e. preserver)."[163] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[164] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf* in everything."[165] And he said: "He is not proof."[166]

`Alī Ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234 H.) said: "He was *ḍa`īf* in our view."[167]

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said: "He is not strong, (yet) the people narrated from him."[168] And he said: "He is nothing."[169]

Al-Jawzajānī said: "He is feeble regarding *aḥādīth*; *ḍa`īf*. He deviated away from the target.[170] He is not to be used as proof."[171]

Al-`Ijlī said: "His *aḥādīth* may be written, and he is not strong."[172] And said: "There is no harm in him."[173]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī (d. 264 H.) said: "He is not strong."[174]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "He is not strong. His *ḥadīth* may be written yet not used for proof."[175]

At-Tirmithī (d. 279 H.) said: "He was a *ṣadūq*, however, he possibly raised things (to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) which others stopped (at those before the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ)."[176]

An-Nasā'ī said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[177]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He was an honourable *shaykh*. And he used to err in narrations and make mistakes in transmission, until that became abundant within his transmissions, and objectionable

---

[162] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/335
[163] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 325
[164] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/335 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/229
[165] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thānī*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 1/491
[166] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/187 and "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/335
[167] "*Su'ālāt Ibn Abī Shaybah Li-Ibn al-Madīnī*" pg.57
[168] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/186
[169] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/335
[170] This is referring to him having extremism in *tashayyu`* (i.e. partisanship to `Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ)
[171] "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 194
[172] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*"by Al-`Ijlī 2/154
[173] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/154
[174] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/187
[175] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/187
[176] "*Al-Jāmi`*" by At-Tirmithī 4/343
[177] "*As-Sunan al-Kubrā*" by An-Nasā'ī 7/29

narrations became evident in what he would narrate from well-known narrators, so he was deserving of being abandoned as a source of proof."[178]

Ibn `Adī said: "He used to go to extremes in *tashayyu`* (i.e. partisanship to `Alī Ibn Abī Ṭālib, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) along with the people of Al-Baṣrah. And despite his weakness, his *aḥādīth* may be written."[179]

Abū Aḥmad *al-Ḥākim* said: "He is not solid according to them (i.e. the scholars of *ḥadīth*)."[180]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "There is slight weakness in him."[181]

As for what Shu`bah Ibn al-Ḥajjāj said: "He narrated to us before he became senile."[182]

And what Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī (d. 277 H.) said: "He became senile in his old age."[183]

Then Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "`Alī Ibn Zayd never became senile whatsoever."[184]

So, either he never became senile and was at the same level of weakness all his life, or he was *ḍa`īf* his whole life, but then became senile later on and became even weaker.

In another chain, *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī (d. 405 H.) said:

أَخْبَرَنِي الْحَسَنُ بْنُ حَلِيمٍ الْمَرْوَزِيُّ: ثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ الشَّذُورِيُّ: ثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ هُبَيْرَةَ: ثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ زَيْدٍ: عَنْ أَيُّوبَ السَّخْتِيَانِيِّ وَعَلِيِّ بْنِ زَيْدِ بْنِ جُدْعَانَ: عَنْ أَبِي نَضْرَةَ قَالَ: أَتَيْنَا عُثْمَانَ بْنَ أَبِي الْعَاصِ..."حَتَّى إِنَّ الْحَجَرَ يَقُولُ: يَا مُؤْمِنُ هَذَا كَافِرٌ فَاقْتُلْهُ."

Al-Ḥasan Ibn Ḥalīm al-Marwazī informed me: Aḥmad Ibn Ibrāhīm ash-Shathūrī told us: Sa`īd Ibn Hubayrah told us: Ḥammād Ibn Zayd told us: On the authority of Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī and `Alī Ibn Zayd Ibn Jad`ān: On the authority of Abū Naḍrah who said: We came to `Uthmān Ibn Abil-`Āṣ…*"To the point that rocks will say: 'O mu'min, this is a kāfir, so kill him.'"*[185]

---

[178] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/103
[179] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/344
[180] Attributed to him by Al-Mizzī in "*Tahthīb al-Kamāl Fī Asmā' ar-Rijāl*" 20/439 and Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī in "*Tahthīb at-Tahthīb*" 7/323
[181] "*Su'ālāt al-Barqānī Lid-Dāraqutnī*" pg. 52
[182] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/334
[183] "*Al-Ma`rifah Wat-Tārīkh*" by Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī 2/741
[184] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 456
[185] Collected by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī (#8,473)

Al-Ḥākim said: "This is a *ḥadīth* with an authentic chain, due to the mention of Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī, yet they (i.e. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim) did not collect it."[186]

We see here that Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī also narrates this *ḥadīth* alongside `Alī Ibn Zayd from Abū Naḍrah. However this chain contains two additional weaknesses before the mention of Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī, so this cannot be used to remove the weakness of `Alī Ibn Zayd.

Ath-Thahabī (d. 748 H.) commented on what *Al-Ḥākim* said by saying: "Ibn Hubayrah is *wāh* (feeble)."[187]

And what Ath-Thahabī said is indeed correct, as Sa`īd Ibn Hubayrah was *ḍa`īf*.

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "He is not strong. He narrated *aḥādīth* which the people of knowledge objected to."[188]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He narrates fabricated narrations from reliable narrators. It is as though he fabricated them or they were fabricated for him and he would respond to them (i.e. pass them on). It is not allowed to use him as proof whatsoever."[189]

Furthermore, Aḥmad Ibn Ibrāhīm ash-Shathūrī is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable and the only person to narrate from him was Al-Ḥasan Ibn Ḥalīm al-Marwazī.

As for the authentication of *Al-Ḥākim*, then it cannot be relied upon.

Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 H.) said: "And very often, *Al-Ḥākim* authenticates *aḥādīth* which can be said, without doubt, are fabricated (and) have no basis."[190]

Ath-Thahabī said: "In his '*Mustadrak*', he authenticates *aḥādīth* which are disreputable, and he does so often."[191]

Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751 H.) said: "And the *ḥuffāth* (preservers) who diagnose defects of *ḥadīth* pay no attention to the authentication of *Al-Ḥākim*. And they do not raise their heads to it. In fact, his authentication does not equal or indicate a *ḥadīth* is *ḥasan* (good). Rather, he authenticates things that are, without any doubt, fabricated according to the people of knowledge of *ḥadīth*."[192]

---

[186] "*Al-Mustadrak `Alaṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*" by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī 4/524
[187] "*Al-Mustadrak `Alaṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*" by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī 4/524
[188] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 4/71
[189] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 1/327
[190] "*Majmū` al-Fatāwā*" by Ibn Taymiyyah 22/426
[191] "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*" by Ath-Thahabī 3/608
[192] "*Al-Furūsiyyah al-Muḥammadiyyah*" by Ibn al-Qayyim pg. 185

Az-Zayla`ī (d. 762 H.) said: "And the authentication of *Al-Ḥākim* is not to be taken into consideration."[193] And he also said: "*Al-Ḥākim* is known for his leniency and for his authentication of *ḍa`īf* and even fabricated *aḥādīth*."[194]

And this phrase appears in another *ḥadīth* on the authority of Samurah Ibn Jundub as well.

Ibn Abī Shaybah said:

الْفَضْلُ بْنُ دُكَيْنٍ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا ثَعْلَبَةُ بْنُ عِبَادٍ الْعَبْدِيُّ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَصْرَةِ أَنَّهُ شَهِدَ يَوْمًا خُطْبَةً لِسَمُرَةَ بْنِ جُنْدُبٍ فَذَكَرَ فِي خُطْبَتِهِ حَدِيثًا عَنْ رَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنَّهُ قَالَ..."حَتَّى إِنَّ جِذْمَ الْحَائِطِ وَأَصْلَ الشَّجَرَةِ يُنَادِي: يَا مُؤْمِنُ هَذَا كَافِرٌ يَسْتَتِرُ بِهِ تَعَالَ اقْتُلْهُ."

Al-Faḍl Ibn Dukayn said: Tha`labah Ibn `Ibād al-`Abdī, (who was) from the people of Al-Baṣrah, told us that one day, he attended a *Khutbah* of Samurah Ibn Jundub. In his *Khutbah*, he mentioned a *ḥadīth* from the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, that he said…*"To the point that the bases of walls and the trunks of trees will call out: 'O believer, this is a kāfir hiding behind it; come kill him.'"*[195]

And Ar-Rūyānī (d. 307 H.) said:

نَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ إِسْحَاقَ: نَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ يُونُسَ وَيَحْيَى بْنُ أَبِي بُكَيْرٍ قَالَا: نَا زُهَيْرُ بْنُ مُعَاوِيَةَ: نَا الْأَسْوَدُ بْنُ قَيْسٍ: حَدَّثَنِي ثَعْلَبَةُ بْنُ عِبَادٍ الْعَبْدِيُّ...

Muḥammad Ibn Isḥāq informed us: Aḥmad Ibn `Abdillāh Ibn Yūnūs and Yaḥyā Ibn Abī Bukayr informed us, both saying: Al-Aswad Ibn Qays informed us: Tha`labah Ibn `Ibād al-`Abdī told me…[196]

And Ibn Khuzaymah (d. 311 H.) said:

أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو طَاهِرٍ: ثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرٍ: ثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى: ثَنَا أَبُو نُعَيْمٍ: عَنِ الْأَسْوَدِ بْنِ قَيْسٍ...

Abū Ṭāhir informed us: Abū Bakr told us: Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyā told us: Abū Nu`aym told us: On the authority of Al-Aswad Ibn Qays…[197]

And Ibn Ḥibbān said:

---

[193] "*Naṣb ar-Rāyah Li-Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Hidāyah*" 1/344
[194] "*Naṣb ar-Rāyah Li-Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Hidāyah*" 1/360
[195] Collected by Ibn Abī Shaybah (#37,513)
[196] Collected by Ar-Rūyānī (#848)
[197] Collected by Ibn Khuzaymah (#1,397)

أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو يَعْلَى قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا خَلَفُ بْنُ هِشَامٍ الْبَزَّارُ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو عَوَانَةَ: عَنِ الْأَسْوَدِ بْنِ قَيْس…

Abū Ya`lā informed us, saying: Khalaf Ibn Hishām al-Bazzār told us, saying: Abū `Awānah told us: On the authority of Al-Aswad Ibn Qays…[198]

And Aṭ-Ṭabarānī said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ ثَنَا حَجَّاجُ بْنُ الْمِنْهَالِ: ح: وَحَدَّثَنَا الْحُسَيْنُ بْنُ إِسْحَاقَ التُّسْتَرِيُّ: ثَنَا يَحْيَى الْحِمَّانِيُّ: قَالَا: ثَنَا أَبُو عَوَانَةَ…

`Alī Ibn `Abdil-`Azīz told us: Ḥajjāj Ibn Minhāl told us: *Ḥā'*:[199] And Al-Ḥusayn Ibn Isḥāq at-Tustarī told us: Yaḥyā al-Ḥimmānī told us, both[200] saying: Abū `Awānah told us…[201]

And Aṭ-Ṭabarānī also said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ: ثَنَا أَبُو غَسَّانَ مَالِكُ بْنُ إِسْمَاعِيلَ: وَحَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَمْرِو بْنِ خَالِدٍ الْحَرَّانِيُّ: ثَنَا أَبِي قَالَا: ثَنَا زُهَيْرٌ: عَنِ الْأَسْوَدِ بْنِ قَيْسٍ…

`Alī Ibn `Abdil-`Azīz told us: Abū Ġassān Mālik Ibn Ismā`īl told us: And Muḥammad Ibn `Amr Ibn Khālid al-Ḥarrānī told us: My father told us, both[202] saying: Zuhayr told us: On the authority of Al-Aswad Ibn Qays…[203]

And *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī said:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَعْقُوبَ: ثَنَا الْحَسَنُ بْنُ مُكْرَمٍ: ثنا أَبُو النَّضْرِ: ثنا زُهَيْرٌ: وَثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ حَمْشَاذٍ الْعَدْلُ: ثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ: ثَنَا أَبُو نُعَيْمٍ: ثنا زُهَيْرٌ…

Abul-`Abbās Muḥammad Ibn Ya`qūb told us: Al-Ḥasan Ibn Mukram told us: Abun-Naḍr told us: Zuhayr told us: And `Alī Ibn Ḥamshāth al-`Adl told us: `Alī Ibn `Abdil-`Azīz told us: Abū Nu`aym told us: Zuhayr told us…[204]

---

[198] Collected by Ibn Ḥibbān (#2,856)

[199] Placing the letter ح (*Ḥā'*) inside a chain of transmission was done by scholars of *ḥadīth* when beginning a chain over in order to show two separate chains to one individual. In this case, there are two separate chains between Aṭ-Ṭabarānī and Abū `Awānah, then the chains join from Abū `Awānah to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

[200] Meaning Ḥajjāj Ibn Minhāl and Yaḥyā al-Ḥimmānī

[201] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (#6,798)

[202] Meaning Mālik Ibn Ismā`īl and `Amr Ibn Khālid al-Ḥarrānī

[203] Collected by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (#6,799)

[204] Collected by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī (#1,230)

Al-Ḥākim an-Naysābūrī said: "This is a *ḥadīth* with an authentic chain according to the conditions of the two shaykhs, and they did not collect it."[205]

However, this is not the case. Tha`labah Ibn `Ibād al-`Abdī is *majhūl*. This was stated by `Alī Ibn al-Madīnī[206] and Al-`Ijlī,[207] and was later supported by Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456 H.)[208] and Ath-Thahabī.[209]

Likewise, no one declared him reliable or truthful.

And finally, he was mentioned by Al-Bukhārī in "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*"[210] and Ibn Abī Ḥātim in "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*"[211] and neither declared anything about him or mentioned what anyone else said about him. This is indicative of him being *majhūl*, as was mentioned earlier.

And these different narrations do not support each other, as they are three separate *aḥādīth* from three different *Ṣaḥābah*.

As demonstrated, there are no authentic chains to the phrase cited by the authors.

On the other hand, we have the phrase *"…a Jew…"* in the *ḥadīth* of Abū Hurayrah in "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*"[212] and "*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim.*"[213] The same wording can also be found in the *ḥadīth* of `Abdullāh Ibn `Umar in "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*"[214] and "*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim.*"[215] In other words, two separate *aḥādīth* at the height of authenticity contradict the phrasing the authors attempted to use.

or "Here is a soldier of *Dajjal*!" (*al-Buhur al-Zakhirah* 1/493) and do not focus on the religious identity.

There are three issues here. The first relates to the translation of the *ḥadīth*, the second to the reference cited and the third to the authenticity of the *ḥadīth* cited.

---

[205] "*Al-Mustadrak `Alaṣ-Ṣaḥīḥayn*" by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī 1/478
[206] Attributed to him by Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī in "*Bayān al-Wahm Wal-Īhām al-Wāqi`ayn Fī Kitāb al-Aḥkām*" 3/196, Ibn al-Mulaqqin in "*Al-Badr al-Munīr Fī Takhrīj al-Aḥādīth Wal-Āthār al-Wāqi`ah Fish-Sharḥ al-Kabīr*" 5/129, Ath-Thahabī in "*Mīzān al-I`tidāl Fī Naqd ar-Rijāl*" 1/371, `Alā' ad-Dīn Muglatāy in "*Ikmāl Tahthīb al-Kamāl*" 3/98 and Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimashqī in "*Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih Fī Ḍabṭ Asmā' ar-Ruwāti Wa Ansābihim Wa Alqābihim Wa Kunāhum*" 2/14
[207] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 1/260
[208] "*Al-Muḥallā Fī Sharḥ al-Mujallā Bil-Ḥujaji Wal-Āthār*" by Ibn Ḥazm 3/360
[209] "*Dīwān aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by Ath-Thahabī pg. 58. And in "*Al-Mugnī Fiḍ-Ḍu`afā'*" 1/122, he said: "It is not known who he is."
[210] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 2/174
[211] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 2/463
[212] (#2,926)
[213] (#2,922)
[214] (#2,925) and (#3,593)
[215] (#2,921)

The first: The *ḥadīth* does not translate as "…a soldier of *Dajjal*…" The word is "*Dajjālī.*" This is the word *Dajjāl* with the letter *Yā'* (ي) added onto it, which is called "*Yā' an-Nasab* (*Yā'* of Attribution)." This means that the person being referred to is attributed to the *Dajjāl*. The best translation is "Follower of the *Dajjāl*" or *Dajjālian*. Just like someone who follows the *sunnah* is a *Sunnī*, or someone from Iraq is an *`Irāqī*; no one would say *Sunnī* means a soldier of the *Sunnah* or *`Irāqī* means a soldier of Iraq.

This translation is an attempt to say: "See, here it is talking about a soldier of the *Dajjāl*, so obviously, the other *ḥadīth* is inevitably referring to the Jewish soldiers of the *Dajjāl*."

And even if that were correct, it does not permit the mistranslation of citations as is well known according to any standards of academia, which the authors claim to uphold.

The second: As for the reference cited, then this is not even a book of *ḥadīth*, rather, it is a book of *`Aqīdah* related to matters of eschatology. Furthermore, the author of this book, As-Saffārīnī, died in the year 1113 H., meaning, only 327 years ago. This is not how a research paper is written.

This would be like someone quoting a *ḥadīth* in "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*", but instead of citing "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" as the source, they cite the travesty of an article currently being discussed.

Therefore, the authors either knew this was not a book of *ḥadīth*, or they did not know. If they knew, then it can be said that they cited this book instead of the actual book because a) they did not want anyone to find the actual chain of the *ḥadīth* and study it, b) do not know how to properly cite Islāmic references, or c) are too lazy or unable to find the original source of this *ḥadīth*. If they did not know, then this shows an astounding level of ignorance related to the sources of knowledge used in Islāmic research.

The third: As for the authenticity of this *ḥadīth*, then it is, in fact, a fabricated *ḥadīth*.

Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād said:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو عُمَرَ عَنِ ابْنِ لَهِيعَةَ عَنْ عَبْدِ الْوَهَّابِ بْنِ حُسَيْنٍ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ ثَابِتٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ الْحَارِثِ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللهِ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ: "إِذَا بَلَغَ الدَّجَّالُ عَقَبَةَ أَفِيقٍ...يَا مُؤْمِنُ هَذَا دَجَّالِي فَاقْتُلْهُ."

Abū `Umar told us: On the authority of Ibn Lahī`ah: On the authority of `Abdul-Wahhāb Ibn Ḥusayn: On the authority of Muḥammad Ibn Thābit: On the authority of his father: On the authority of Al-Ḥārith: On the authority of `Abdullāh: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who said: *"When the Dajjāl reaches (the town of) `Aqabah Afīq…"* Until the end of the *ḥadīth*

which states: *"O Mu'min; this is a Dajjālī, so kill him."*[216] The *ḥadīth* is extremely lengthy, so only the relevant part was kept here.

There are eight clear defects in this chain:

The first: Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād is *ḍa`īf*, and some accused him of fabricating *aḥādīth*.

This was previously explained in detail.

The second: Abū `Umar, who is Ḥammād Ibn Wāqid aṣ-Ṣaffār, is *ḍa`īf*.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "I do not know him."[217] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[218] So, at first, he was unaware of his condition, and later came to know of his weakness.

`Amr Ibn `Alī al-Fallās said: "He had many errors. He had many mistakes. He is not from amongst those who are to be narrated from."[219]

Al-Bukhārī said: "*Munkar al-ḥadīth*."[220]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī said: "His *aḥādīth* are lacking in strength."[221]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "He is not strong. His *aḥādīth* are lacking in strength. His a*ḥādīth* may be written for *i`tibār* (meaning used in consideration with other narrations)."[222]

At-Tirmithī said: "He is not a *ḥāfith*."[223]

Al-`Uqaylī said: "He contradicts (others) in his *aḥādīth*." [224]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "It is not allowed to use his narrations as proof when he is the only one narrating."[225]

Ibn `Adī said: "And Ḥammād Ibn Wāqid had *aḥādīth*, which were not many. And no trustworthy narrators followed him in anything that he narrates."[226]

---

[216] Collected by Nu`aym Ibn Ḥammād (#1,601)
[217] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 433
[218] "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dawrī*" 4/122
[219] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 3/27
[220] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 3/27
[221] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/150
[222] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/150
[223] "*Al-Jāmi`*" by At-Tirmithī 5/458
[224] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/312
[225] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 1/253
[226] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 3/28

The third: The *tafarrud* of Abū `Umar from Ibn Lahī`ah:

`Abdullāh Ibn Lahī`ah was a major narrator of *aḥādīth* in Egypt in his time and he had dozens of students. Amongst them were narrators who are considered much more acceptable when narrating *aḥādīth* from him. This is due to the fact that they narrated from him early on, and would actually review his writings, instead of merely taking what he narrated from memory. This is in addition to the other factors, which placed those other narrators at a higher level than the rest of those who transmitted from him.

Amongst these were `Abdullāh Ibn Wahb, `Abdullāh Ibn Yazīd al-Muqri', `Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubārak, `Abdullāh Ibn Maslamah al-Qa`nabī, Lahī`ah Ibn `Īsā, Abul-Aswad An-Naḍr Ibn `Abdil-Jabbār, Ibn Abī Maryam, Ibn Rumḥ, Abū Sa`īd Mawlā Banī Hāshim, Bishr Ibn Bakr, Isḥāq Ibn `Īsā aṭ-Ṭabbā`, Yaḥyā Ibn Isḥāq, Al-Walīd Ibn Yazīd, Al-Layth Ibn Sa`d, `Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Mahdī and others. Yet, somehow this one *ḍa`īf* narrator is supposed to have taken this *ḥadīth* from him, to the exclusion of all of the other narrators who took from him, including his major companions and major *Imāms* in his time?

The fourth: Ibn Lahī`ah, who is `Abdullah Ibn Lahī`ah, is *ḍa`īf*.

Bishr Ibn as-Sarī (d. 195 H.) said: "If you saw Ibn Lahī`ah, you wouldn't take anything from him."[227]

And it has come from Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198 H.) that he did not consider him to be anything.[228]

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He is *ḍa`īf* when it comes to *aḥādīth*."[229] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[230] And he said: "His *aḥādīth* are not used as proof."[231] And he said: "In all of his *aḥādīth*, he is nothing."[232] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf* in all of his *aḥādīth*, not (just) in some of them."[233] And he said: "What was before the burning of his books may be written from him."[234] And he said: "His *aḥādīth* are not very strong."[235] And he said: "He is nothing, whether he changed (later in life) or did not change."[236]

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said: "The *ḥadīth* of Ibn Lahī`ah are not a proof. I write much of what I write to take into consideration (with other narrations), and it strengthens each other."[237]

---

[227] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 5/238 and "*Al-Majrūhīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/13
[228] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" 5/182 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' aṣ-Ṣagīr*" pg. 80, both by Al-Bukhārī
[229] "*Ma`rifat ar-Rijāl `An Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn*" by Ibn Miḥraz 1/67 and "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dārimī*" pg. 153
[230] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Ibn `Adī 2/293
[231] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Ibn `Adī 2/293
[232] "*Ma`rifat ar-Rijāl `An Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn*" by Ibn Miḥraz 1/67
[233] "*Ma`rifat ar-Rijāl `An Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn*" by Ibn Miḥraz 1/67
[234] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Ibn `Adī 2/293
[235] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/147
[236] "*Min Kalām Abī Zakariyyā Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn Fir-Rijāl Riwāyat Ibn Ṭahmān*" pg. 108
[237] Attributed to him by Al-Mizzī in "*Tahthīb al-Kamāl Fī Asmā' ar-Rijāl*" 15/493 and Ibn Rajab in "*Sharḥ `Ilal at-Tirmithī*" 1/420

Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261 H.) said: "He was abandoned by Ibn Mahdī, Yaḥyā and Wakī`."[238]

And he was weakened by Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī and Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī. They then said: "As for Ibn Lahī`ah, then his matter is confusing. His *aḥādīth* are written to take into consideration." Abū Ḥātim was then asked: "If the one narrating from Ibn Lahī`ah is the likes of Ibn al-Mubārak and Ibn Wahb, can it be used as proof?" He said: "No."[239]

At-Tirmithī said: "Ibn Lahī`ah is *ḍa`īf* according to the People of *Ḥadīth*. He was weakened by Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-Qaṭṭān and others."[240]

Al-Jawzajānī said: "His *aḥādīth* are not to be stopped on (i.e. they should be overlooked). And they should not be used as proof. And one should not be fooled by his narrations."[241]

An-Nasā'ī weakened him and said: "I did not collect anything from his *aḥādīth* at all, except for one *ḥadīth*."[242]

Ibn Khuzaymah said: "Ibn Lahī`ah, رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, does not meet our condition for those who are used as proof."[243]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "It is obligatory to avoid the narrations of those who narrated from him early on before his books burned, due to the reports which have been narrated in *tadlīs* form, from *ḍa`īf* and abandoned narrators. And it is obligatory to abandon using, as proof, the narrations of those who narrated from him after his books burned, due to what they contain from that which is not from his *aḥādīth*."[244]

Abū Aḥmad *al-Ḥākim* said: "He is gone when it comes to *ḥadīth*."[245]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "He is *ḍa`īf* when it comes to *ḥadīth*."[246] And he said: "His *aḥādīth* are not to be used as proof."[247] And he said: "He is not used as proof."[248] And he said: "He is not strong."[249]

---

[238] "*Al-Kunā Wal-Asmā'*" by Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj 1/519
[239] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/147
[240] "*Al-Jāmi` al-Kabīr*" by At-Tirmithī 1/60
[241] "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 266
[242] "*Tārīkh Ibn Yūnus aṣ-Ṣadafī al-Miṣrī*" 1/282
[243] "*At-Tawḥīd Wa Ithbāt Sifāt ar-Rabb `Azza Wa Jall*" by Ibn Khuzaymah 2/696
[244] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/13
[245] Attributed to him by `Alā' ad-Dīn Muglatāy in "*Ikmāl Tahthīb al-Kamāl*" 8/147
[246] "*As-Sunan*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 1/129
[247] "*As-Sunan*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 1/128
[248] "*As-Sunan*" 3/9 and "*Al-`Ilal al-Wāridah Fil-Aḥādīth an-Nabawiyyah*" 5/346 both by Ad-Dāraquṭnī
[249] "*As-Sunan*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 2/162

The fifth: `Abdul-Wahhāb Ibn Ḥusayn is *majhūl*.

No one mentioned anything about him, other than *Al-Ḥākim* who said: "`Abdul-Wahhāb Ibn al-Ḥusayn is *majhūl*."[250]

He is only in this chain of narration, which is only in this *ḥadīth* and one other narrated by *Al-Ḥākim*. And Ath-Thahabī stated about the other *ḥadīth* with this chain: "That is fabricated."[251]

The sixth: Muḥammad Ibn Thābit is Muḥammad Ibn Thābit Ibn Aslam al-Bunānī. He is *ḍa`īf*.

`Affān Ibn Muslim aṣ-Ṣaffār (d. 220 H.) said: "Muḥammad Ibn Thābit al-Bunānī is a truthful man in and of himself, however, he is *ḍa`īf* with regards to *ḥadīth*."[252]

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He is nothing."[253]

And he (Yaḥyā ibn Ma`īn)[254] and Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī[255] both said: "He is not strong."

Al-Bukhārī said: "*Fīhi Nathar* (He is suspect)."[256]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī said: "He is *layyin* (i.e. lacking in strength)."[257]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī also said: "His *aḥādīth* may be written, but they are not to be used as proof. He is *munkar* when it comes to *ḥadīth*."[258]

Abū Dāwūd,[259] An-Nasā'ī[260] and Ad-Dāraquṭnī[261] all said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He narrates from his father what is not from his *aḥadīth*, as though it is a different Thābit. It is not allowed to use him as proof nor to narrate from him, despite his small amount (of *ḥadīth*)."[262]

---

[250] "*Al-Mustadrak `Alas-Ṣaḥīḥayn*" by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī 4/566
[251] "*Al-Mustadrak `Alas-Ṣaḥīḥayn*" by *Al-Ḥākim* an-Naysābūrī 4/566
[252] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 7/217
[253] "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dawrī*" 2/507 and "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 7/217
[254] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 7/217
[255] "*Al-Ma`rifah Wat-Tārīkh*" by Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī 2/664
[256] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 1/50
[257] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 7/217
[258] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 7/217
[259] "*Su'ālāt al-Ājurrī Li-Abī Dāwūd*" by Abū `Ubayd Al-Ājurrī 3/242
[260] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī, pg. 91
[261] "*Su'ālāt as-Sulamī Lid-Dāraquṭnī*" pg. 276
[262] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/252

And in proving his weakness, Ibn `Adī said: "And these *aḥādīth*, along with others which I did not mention; all of them are from that which no one followed him in."[263]

The seventh: Al-Ḥārith Ibn `Abdillāh al-A`war. The words of the scholars of *ḥadīth* vary between him being declared *ḍa`īf* to being declared a liar.

Ibrāhīm an-Nakha`ī (d. 96 H.) accused him of lying.[264]

Ash-Sha`bī (d. 100 H.) said: "And I testify that he is one of the liars."[265]

And he (Ash-Sha`bī)[266] and Abū Isḥāq as-Sabī`ī (d. 127 H.)[267] said: "And he was a liar."

Zuhayr Ibn Mu`āwiyah al-Ju`fī (d. 173 H.), `Alī Ibn al-Madīnī[268] and Zuhayr Ibn Ḥarb (d. 234 H.)[269] all said: "He is a *kaṯhāb* (frequent liar)."

`Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Mahdī (d. 198 H.) abandoned his *aḥādīth*.[270]

Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said: "And he is *ḍa`īf* in his narrations."[271]

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[272]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī said: "His *aḥādīth* are not to be used as proof."[273]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "He is *ḍa`īf*. He is not strong and not from those whose *aḥādīth* are to be used as proof."[274]

---

[263] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī, 7/315
[264] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" 2/273, "*At-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ*" 1/156 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' aṣ-Ṣaġīr*" pg. 40 all by Al-Bukhārī, "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/78 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/208
[265] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 2/273, "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 2/449-450, "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 33 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/208
[266] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 6/186, "*Muqaddimat Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*" by Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj 1/19, "*Su'ālāt al-Bartha`ī Li-Abī Zur`ah*" 2/587 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/208
[267] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/78, "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 2/449 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/208
[268] "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 42, "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 1/208 and "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 2/449
[269] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/79
[270] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/79
[271] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 6/186
[272] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/79
[273] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/79
[274] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/79

At-Tirmithī said: "And some of the people of knowledge weakened Al-Ḥārith al-A`war."[275] And he said: "Some of the people of knowledge weakened Al-Ḥārith."[276]

An-Nasā'ī said: "He is not strong."[277]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He was an extremist in *tashayyu`*; *wāhī* (Feeble) in *ḥadīth*."[278]

Ibn `Adī said: "And Al-Ḥārith al-A`war has (*aḥādīth*) from `Alī, and most of what he narrates is from `Alī, and he narrated a small amount from Ibn Mas`ūd. And all of what he narrates from them is not *maḥfūth*[279]."[280]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī mentioned him in his book of *ḍa`īf* and abandoned narrators.[281]

The eighth: The *tafarrud* of Al-Ḥārith Ibn `Abdillāh al-A`war from `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd.

None of `Abdullāh Ibn Mas`ūd's major companions, such as `Alqamah Ibn Qays, Masrūq Ibn al-Ajda`, Al-Aswad Ibn Yazīd, `Abīdah as-Salmānī, Abū Wā'il Shaqīq Ibn Salamah or `Amr Ibn Shuraḥbīl narrated this *ḥadīth* from him. In fact, out of the hundreds of narrators reported to have narrated from him, none narrated this *ḥadīth* from him other than this unknown narrator with almost no *aḥādīth*.

As is quite clear from the above section, the authors of this article turned away from what is authentic and undisputed from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In place of this, they resorted to quoting something that was fabricated, in an attempt to reduce the significance of any conflict between the Muslims and the Jews, to insinuate that the reason for the conflict between the Muslims and the Jews is merely their support of the Dajjāl and to support their earlier absurd claim that "Jews are amongst the good guys in the Muslim apocalypse."

Therefore, this *hadith* describes a future battle between warriors and can only occur after the return of Jesus; in no way can it be interpreted as a prescription to go out and harm civilians or peaceful members of any faith community.

No one disputes that this relates to future events and not to our time. This is merely a strawman argument, and quite a pathetic one, as the authors do not even respond well to their own claim.

---

[275] "*Al-Jāmi`*" by At-Tirmithī 1/369
[276] "*Al-Jāmi`*" by At-Tirmithī 3/487
[277] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 2/451
[278] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 1/222
[279] *Maḥfūṭh* literally means preserved, and when a *ḥadīth* is considered *maḥfūṭh* in the terminology of the *muḥaddithīn*, it means that either the *isnād* or the *matn* (main text) of the *ḥadīth* is considered to be what is known and accepted amongst them as being correct – so in essence, preserved by them.
[280] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 2/451
[281] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkūn*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 2/148

The Qur'an explicitly condemns violence against civilians and noncombatants, stating "Whoever kills a soul it is as if he has slain all humanity," (5:32) and, "So if they withdraw and do not fight you, and offer you peace, then God gives you no way against them," (4:90).

War is only permitted in defense against aggression or to aid the oppressed, as in the case of Jesus fighting against the *Dajjal's* forces.

In the original article, the underlined statement contained a hyperlink to an article[282] in which there was an attempt to back up this claim. However, since the point of this essay is to comment on one specific article, I will not fully discuss it.

Nonetheless, in summary, this is a statement which is in clear contradiction of the texts of the Revelation and contrary to how they were understood by the scholars of Islām.

Abū Bakr al-Jaṣṣāṣ al-Ḥanafī (d. 370 H.) said: "And we do not know of anyone from amongst the *fuqahā'* (jurists) who forbid fighting those from amongst the polytheists who does not become involved in fighting us."[283]

As for specific discussions, one may look to the words of the following scholars:

Abū Bakr al-Jaṣṣāṣ al-Ḥanafī,[284] Ibn Ḥazm ath-Thāhirī,[285] Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah al-Ḥanbalī,[286] Shams ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah al-Ḥanbalī (d. 682 H.),[287] Ibn Kathīr ad-Dimashqī ash-Shāfi`ī,[288] Az-Zabīdī al-Ḥanafī (d. 800 H.),[289] *Mullā* Khusrū al-Ḥanafī (d. 885 H.) and[290] `Alā' ad-Dīn al-Mirdāwī al-Ḥanbalī (d. 885 H.).[291]

Throughout these and other discussions, we find statements explaining that *jihād* is obligatory, even if the Muslims are not attacked first, and that it is obligatory upon the *Imām* of the Muslims to send an army to attack once or twice a year in order to place pressure upon the disbelievers to enter Islām or to pay the *jizyah*, or at the very least, to deter them from attacking in the future.

In fact, any discussion on the topic of *jizyah* contains a refutation of this absurd claim.

---

[282] https://yaqeeninstitute.org/en/justin-parrott/jihad-as-defense-just-war-theory-in-the-quran-and-sunnah/
[283] "*Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*" by Al-Jaṣṣāṣ 2/278
[284] "*Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*" by Al-Jaṣṣāṣ 4/312
[285] "*Al-Muḥallā Fī Sharḥ al-Mujallā Bil-Ḥujaji Wal-Āthār*" by Ibn Ḥazm 5/340
[286] "*Al-Mugnī*" by Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah 9/197
[287] "*Ash-Sharḥ al-Kabīr `Alal-Muqni`*" Shams ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah al-Ḥanbalī 10/12
[288] "*Al-Bidāyah Wan-Nihāyah*" by Ibn Kathīr 7/144
[289] "*Al-Jawharah an-Niyarah `Alā Mukhtaṣar al-Qaddūrī*" by Az-Zabīdī 2/257
[290] "*Durar al-Ḥukkām Sharḥ Ġurar al-Aḥkām*" by Khusrū al-Ḥanafī 1/282
[291] "*Al-Inṣāf Fī Ma`rifat ar-Rājiḥ Min al-Khilāf*" by Al-Mirdāwī 10/12

The question of Anti-Semitism and the Armageddon

All three Abrahamic faiths (Islam, Christianity, and Judaism) have well-established traditions about a prophesied Messiah who will engage in a battle against the forces of evil in the end times, whether it be the return of Christ who will battle all the nations of the earth, or the coming of the Masiach ben Yossef who will destroy the Edomites and enemies of Israel. **Footnote:** [["Appendix II – Mashiach in Jewish Law by Rabbi Dr. J. Immanuel Schochet, from his book *Mashiach— the Messianic Era in Jewish Law* on Chabad.org. Dr. Schochet writes, "Interestingly enough, according to Pirkei deR. Eliezer ch. 28 (in non-censored versions), the Ishmaelites (Arabs) will be the final kingdom to be defeated by Mashiach." http://www.chabad.org/library/moshiach/article_cdo/aid/101747/jewish/Appendix-II.htm#footnote6a101747]]

All three groups have had to explicate these esoteric eschatological passages in order to steer clear of antagonism towards other communities. In 2012, A DNC County Chairman resigned after he said, "The Christians just want us to be there so we can be slaughtered and converted and bring on the second coming of Jesus Christ." **Footnote:** [[http://americanvision.org/6370/christians-just-want-jews-slaughtered-and-converted/]]

The Bible describes the Armageddon in painful terms regarding the enemies of Christ/Israel (See: Zechariah 14:12). **Footnote:** [[http://biblehub.com/zechariah/14-12.htm]]

It's necessary for people of all faiths to not allow their texts about the end times to be hijacked in a way that validates hateful speech or actions in the present. All Abrahamic faiths have eschatological teachings that are esoteric and require careful critical interpretation. The mainstream leaders of all faith communities have consistently emphasized tolerance and respect for others.

Islam denounces all forms of anti-Semitism and racism

The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ taught his companions to respect people of all faith backgrounds and to care for everyone. He said, "Donate in charity to people of all faiths" (*Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah* 3/177) **Footnote:** [[*Musannaf ibn Abi Shaybah*, and *Silsilah al-Saheehah* vol 6, p. 628. Arabic: (تصدقوا على أهل الأديان كلها)]]

Firstly: This *ḥadīth* is *ḍa`īf*.

Ibn Abī Shaybah said:

حَدَّثَنَا جَرِيرُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ عَنْ أَشْعَثَ عَنْ جَعْفَرٍ عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُبَيْرٍ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: لَا تَصَدَّقُوا إِلَّا عَلَى أَهْلِ دِينِكُمْ فَأَنْزَلَ اللهُ تَعَالَى:{لَيْسَ عَلَيْكَ هُدَاهُمْ} إِلَى قَوْلِهِ:{وَمَا تُنْفِقُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ يُوَفَّ إِلَيْكُمْ} قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ : "تَصَدَّقُوا عَلَى أَهْلِ الْأَدْيَانِ."

Jarīr Ibn `Abdil-Ḥamīd told us: On the authority of Ash`ath: On the authority of Ja`far: On the authority of Sa`īd Ibn Jubayr who said: The Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: *"Do not give charity except to the people of your religion."* Then, Allāh, تَعَالَى, Revealed:

{Not upon you, [O Muḥammad]**, is** [responsibility for] **their guidance…}** until His Statement: **{…And whatever you spend of good - it will be fully repaid to you…}.** He said: The Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: *"Give in charity to the people of (all) the religions."*[292]

This narration is *ḍa`īf*, as it is a *mursal*; meaning there is a break in the chain between Sa`īd Ibn Jubayr (a *tābi`ī*) and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

And this *ḥadīth* was mentioned by *Imām* Muḥammad Ibn `Abdil-Hādī (d. 744 H.) in a treatise regarding *ḍa`īf* narrations that may not be used as proof.[293]

And if one makes the claim that many scholars accepted *mursal* narrations as proof, then the reply to this is that many, if not most, rejected *mursal* narrations as proof. And as long as there is a break in the chain, we do not know who the missing person is, so we cannot state that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, made this statement.

There is a second narration in which Ibn Abī Ḥātim said:

حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ بْنِ عَطِيَّةَ ثنا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ الدَّشْتَكِيُّ ثنا أَبِي عَنْ أَبِيهِ حَدَّثَنَا الأَشْعَثُ بْنُ إِسْحَاقَ عَنْ جَعْفَرٍ عَنِ سَعِيدِ بْنِ جُبَيْرٍ عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنَّهُ كَانَ يَأْمُرُ بِأَنْ لَا يُصَدَّقَ إِلا عَلَى أَهْلِ الإِسْلامِ حَتَّى نَزَلَتْ وَمَا تُنْفِقُوا مِنْ شَيْءٍ فِي سَبِيلِ اللهِ يُوَفَّ إِلَيْكُمْ فَأَمَرَ بِالصَّدَقَةِ بَعْدَهَا عَلَى كُلِّ مَنْ سَأَلَكَ مِنْ كُلِّ دَيْنٍ.

Aḥmad Ibn al-Qāsim Ibn `Aṭiyyah told us: Aḥmad Ibn `Abdir-Raḥmān ad-Dashtakī told us: My father told us: On the authority of his father: (that) Al-Ash`ath Ibn Isḥāq told us: On the authority of Ja`far: On the authority of Sa`īd Ibn Jubayr: On the authority of Ibn `Abbās: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, that he used to command that charity not be given except to the People of Islām, until **{And whatever you spend in the cause of Allāh will be fully repaid to**

[292] "*Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*" (#10,398)
[293] "*Majmū` Rasā'il al-Ḥāfith Ibn `Abdil-Hādī*" pg. 107

you…} [*Al-Anfāl*, 60] was Revealed. Then, after that, he commanded that charity be given to all those who ask (from) you from every religion.[294]

Some may claim that since this narration mentions Ibn `Abbās between Sa`īd Ibn Jubayr and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the defect of *irsāl* (or being *mursal*) is removed. However, this is not the case. This is because the narration that contains Ibn `Abbās contains the narrator `Abdullāh Ibn Sa`d ad-Dashtakī, who is *majhūl*, so the chain leading up to Ibn `Abbās is *ḍa`īf*. This is also supported by the fact that this chain of transmission is longer; i.e. further away from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which is a factor that can be taken into consideration when verifying which of two or more chains of narration is correct. Therefore, this cannot be used to support the earlier narration or remove any of the defects.

Likewise, each narration mentions a different verse which was revealed for this incident, so they wouldn't strengthen each other, as they don't match.

Secondly: The *ḥadīth* states:

"تَصَدَّقُوا عَلَى أَهْلِ الْأَدْيَانِ."

"Give in charity upon the people of (all) the religions."

It does not state:

"تَصَدَّقُوا عَلَى أَهْلِ الْأَدْيَانِ كُلِّهِا."

"Give in charity upon the people of all the religions."

The word "كُلِّهِا (all)" does not appear in the *ḥadīth*. Rather, it appears in secondary sources which cite the *ḥadīth*. Therefore, it is clear that the authors did not obtain the *ḥadīth* from "*Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*" and merely relied on other sources and did not take the care to perform the research themselves.

Yes, this has no effect on the understanding, but it is further proof that the authors do not take care to perform careful research.

Thirdly: The issue here is the attribution of this statement to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and not necessarily the reason this verse was revealed. I say this because there are more narrations which give a similar incident regarding why this verse was revealed, however, they do not contain

[294] "*Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-`Athīm"* by Ibn Abī Ḥātim (#9,114)

this statement attributed to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. And, in fact, these narrations are not without defects as well.

…and he personally used to donate money regularly to sponsor a Jewish family in his community. **Footnote:** [[*Kitab al-Amwal*, Abu Ubayd al-Qasim ibn Sallam d224H, pp. 727-728, Dar alShuruq 1989 . Arabic:

(عن سعيد بن المسيب أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم تصدق على أهل بيت من اليهود بصدقة ، فهي تجري عليهم).]]

This *ḥadīth* is *ḍa`īf*.

The *ḥadīth* is: Abū `Ubayd Al-Qāsim Ibn Sallām said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ مَهْدِيٍّ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ الْمُبَارَكِ عَنِ ابْنِ لَهِيعَةَ عَنْ زُهْرَةَ بْنِ مَعْبَدٍ عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ الْمُسَيِّبِ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ تَصَدَّقَ صَدَقَةً عَلَى أَهْلِ بَيْتٍ مِنَ الْيَهُودِ فَهِيَ تُجْرَى عَلَيْهِمْ.

`Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Mahdī told us: On the authority of `Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubārak: On the authority of Ibn Lahī`ah: On the authority of Zuhrah Ibn Ma`bad: On the authority of Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib: That the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, gave in charity to a family of Jews, so it continues to be given to them.

There are three clear defects in this chain.

The first: `Abdullāh Ibn Lahī`ah is *ḍa`īf*, as was previously explained in detail.

As for the claim some make that if the narrator from him is `Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubārak, then it is acceptable, then this is a mistaken understanding.

`Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Mahdī said: "I do not take anything I have heard from Ibn Lahī`ah into consideration, except for what was heard by Ibn al-Mubārak and the likes of him."[295] Meaning, what he narrated is not proof, but may be used in supporting other narrations.

Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said: "And he was *ḍa`īf*. And whoever heard from him in the beginning has a better condition in his narrations than those who heard from him at his end."[296]

`Amr Ibn `Alī al-Fallās said: "His books burned. Therefore, whoever wrote from him before that, such as Ibn al-Mubārak and `Abdullāh Ibn Yazīd al-Muqri', then these are more correct than those who wrote after his books burned. And he is *ḍa`īf* when it comes to *ḥadīth*."[297]

---

[295] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Ibn `Adī 2/293
[296] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 7/516
[297] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/147

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: “That which the `Abādalah (i.e. the `Abdullāhs); Ibn al-Mubārāk, Al-Muqri’ and Ibn Wahb, narrated from him may be taken into consideration.”[298]

What these statements imply is that the narrations of `Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubārak and others who narrated from Ibn Lahī`ah before his books burned have less weaknesses to them than the narrations of those who narrated from him after his books burned, so they may be considered with other narrations - NOT that they are acceptable in and of themselves. This is because Ibn Lahī`ah was *ḍa`īf* even before he lost his books, but his weakness intensified afterwards.

The second: The *tafarrud* of Zuhrah Ibn Ma`bad from Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib.

None of the main narrators from Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib, such as Muḥammad Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī, Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-Anṣārī, Qatādah Ibn Da`āmah, Sumay *māwlā* Abī Bakr Ibn `Abdir-Raḥmān and Sa`d Ibn Ibrāhīm az-Zuhrī, narrated this *ḥadīth* from him. In fact, the narrators from him in general are in the hundreds, yet no one narrated it from him other than Zuhrah Ibn Ma`bad.

The third: There is a break in the chain between Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Sa`īd Ibn al-Musayyib is from the *tābi`īn* and not from the *Ṣaḥābah*, as is well known.

When the Prophet ﷺ saw the funeral procession of a Jew passing by, he stood up out of respect. When some companions pointed out that the deceased was not Muslim, he rebuked them stating, “Is it not a human soul?” (*Sahih Bukhari* 1250). The lesson here is to respect all humanity.

This *ḥadīth* is: On the authority of `Abdur-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Laylā who said:

كَانَ سَهْلُ بْنُ حُنَيْفٍ وقَيْسُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ قَاعِدَيْنِ بِالْقَادِسِيَّةِ فَمَرُّوا عَلَيْهِمَا بِجَنَازَةٍ فَقَامَا فَقِيلَ لَهُمَا: إِنَّهَا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْأَرْضِ أَيْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الذِّمَّةِ فَقَالَا: "إِنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مَرَّتْ بِهِ جَنَازَةٌ فَقَامَ فَقِيلَ لَهُ: إِنَّهَا جَنَازَةُ يَهُودِيٍّ فَقَالَ: "أَلَيْسَتْ نَفْسـًا."

“Sahl Ibn Ḥunayf and Qays Ibn Sa`d were sitting in (the city of) Al-Qādisiyyah. A funeral procession passed in front of them and they stood up. It was said to them: ‘It was for one of the inhabitants of the land,’ in other words, from the People of *thimmah*. They said, ‘A funeral procession passed in front of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and he stood up. He was told that it was the funeral of a Jew, so he said: ‘*Is it not a soul?*’”[299]

---

[298] “*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā’ Wal-Matrūkūn*” by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 265

[299] Collected by Ibn Abī Shaybah (#11,918), Aḥmad (#23,842), Al-Bukhārī (#1,312), Muslim (#961), An-Nasā’ī (#2,059) and Abū Ya`lā (#1,437)

When the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, stood up, he was not standing out of respect for a dead disbeliever. Instead, we have another narration that explains what was meant by '*Is it not a soul?*':

On the authority of Jābir Ibn `Abdillāh, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who said:

مَرَّتْ جَنَازَةٌ فَقَامَ لَهَا رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَقُمْنَا مَعَهُ. فَقُلْنَا: "يَا رَسُولَ اللهِ إِنَّهَا يَهُودِيَّةٌ." فَقَالَ: "إِنَّ الْمَوْتَ فَزَعٌ فَإِذَا رَأَيْتُمْ الْجَنَازَةَ فَقُومُوا."

"A funeral procession passed by, so the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, stood up for it and we stood up with him. Then we said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, it is that of a Jew." So he said: *'Verily, death brings about panic. Therefore, if you see a funeral procession, stand up.'"*[300]

By looking at both narrations, we see that it was a soul passing into death and the reflection this should cause that he stood up for.

And since the authors demonstrated an uncanny knack for using weak, extremely weak or even fabricated narrations when trying to explain away authentic ones, it is extremely strange that they chose to overlook the following narrations on this topic:

On the authority of Anas Ibn Mālik, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

أَنَّ جِنَازَةً مَرَّتْ بِرَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَامَ. فَقِيلَ: إِنَّهَا جِنَازَةُ يَهُودِيٍّ. قَالَ: "إِنَّمَا قُمْنَا لِلْمَلائِكَةِ."

That a funeral procession passed by the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, so he stood. Then it was said: 'It is the funeral procession of a Jew.' So he said: *'Indeed, we only stood for the Angels.'"*[301]

And in a narration:

"إِنَّمَا قُمْتُ لِمَا مَعَهَا مِنَ الْمَلائِكَةِ." أَوْ "إِنَّمَا قُمْتُ لِلْمَلائِكَةِ."

"Indeed, I only stood for the Angels who were with it." Or: *"Indeed, I only stood for the Angels."*[302]

---

[300] Collected by Aḥmad (#14,427), `Abd Ibn Ḥumayd (#1,153), Al-Bukhārī (#1,311), Muslim (#960). Abū Dāwūd (#3,174), An-Nasā'ī (#2,060) and Abū Ya`lā (#1,950). Al-Bukhārī's narration only contains the last sentence.

[301] Collected by An-Nasā'ī (#2,066), and it was declared "*Ṣaḥīḥ* according to the conditions of Muslim" by An-Nawawī in "*Khulāṣat al-Aḥkām Fī Muhimmāt as-Sunani Wa Qawā`id al-Islām*" 2/1007, and it was declared "*Ṣaḥīḥ*" by Al-Albānī in "*Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan an-Nasā'ī*" (#1,928)

[302] Collected by Al-Bazzār (#7,264) and *Al-Ḥākim* (#1,321) with only the second phrasing and he declared it "Authentic according to the conditions of Muslim."

And on the authority of `Abdullāh Ibn `Amr Ibn al-`Āṣ, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا:

أَنَّهُ سَأَلَ رَجُلٌ رَسُولَ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَالَ: "يَا رَسُولَ اللهِ تَمُرُّ بِنَا جَنَازَةُ الْكَافِرِ أَفَنَقُومُ لَهَا؟" قَالَ: "نَعَمْ قُومُوا لَهَا فَإِنَّكُمْ لَسْتُمْ تَقُومُونَ لَهَا إِنَّمَا تَقُومُونَ إِعْظَامًا لِلَّذِي يَقْبِضُ النُّفُوسَ."

"That a man asked the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, saying: 'O Messenger of Allāh; the funeral procession of a disbeliever (sometimes) passes by us; should we stand for it?' He said: *'Yes, stand for it, as you are not standing for it (in and of itself), but indeed, you are only standing out of exaltation for the One Who seizes the nufūs (souls).'"*[303]

And in another narration:

"نَعَمْ فَقُومُوا لَهَا. فَإِنَّكُمْ لَسْتُمْ تَقُومُونَ لَهَا إِنَّمَا تَقُومُونَ إِعْظَامًا لِلَّذِي يَقْبِضُ الأَرْوَاحَ."

"Yes, stand for it, as you are not standing for it (in and of itself), but indeed, you are only standing out of exaltation for The One Who Seizes the arwāḥ (souls)."[304]

Some Jews converted to Islam and yet others, like the Rabbi Mukhayriq, continued to practice Judaism and still remained on good terms with the Prophet ﷺ (*Seerah Ibn Hisham* 1/518).

There are two problems with mentioning this story. The first relates to the authenticity and the second to what the story actually proves.

Firstly: Concerning the authenticity of the story of Mukhayrīq, Ibn Rajab said: "And Ibn Sa`d narrated it with numerous chains of transmission, and they contain weakness."[305]

As for the details of each narration:

1. Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said:

أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ أَخْبَرَنَا صَالِحُ بن جعفر عَنِ الْمَيْسُورِ بْنِ رِفَاعَةَ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ كَعْبٍ قَالَ: أَوَّلُ صَدَقَةٍ فِي الإِسْلامِ وَقْفُ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَمْوَالَهُ لَمَّا قُتِلَ مُخَيْرِيقٌ بِأُحُدٍ. وَأُوصِي إِنْ أُصِبْتُ فَأَمْوَالِي لِرَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَبَضَهَا رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَتَصَدَّقَ بِهَا.

---

[303] Collected by Aḥmad (#6,573), `Abd Ibn Ḥumayd (#340) and *Al-Ḥākim* (#1,320) and he (i.e. *Al-Ḥākim*) declared it "*Ṣaḥīḥ*". It was declared "*Ḥasan*" by Badr ad-Dīn al-`Aynī in "*Nukhab al-Afkār Fī Tanqīḥ Mabānī al-Akhbār Fī Sharḥ Ma`ānī al-Āthār*" 7/275 and by Aḥmad Shākir in his verification of "*Musnad Aḥmad*" 6/145

[304] Collected by Ibn Ḥibbān in his "*Ṣaḥīḥ*" (#3,053) and it was declared "*Qawī* (Strong)" by Shu`ayb al-Arna'ūṭ in "*Al-Iḥsān Fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*" 7/325

[305] "*Fatḥ al-Bārī Fī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" by Ibn Rajab 3/299

Muḥammad Ibn `Umar informed us: Ṣāliḥ Ibn Ja`far informed us: From Al-Maysūr Ibn Rifā`ah: From Muḥammad Ibn Ka`b who said: "The first charity in Islām designated as *waqf* was by the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, of his wealth, when Mukhayrīq was killed at Uḥud. He (i.e. Mukhayrīq) bequeathed that: 'If I am killed, my wealth goes to the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.' So, the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, took it and gave it as charity."[306]

There are three clear defects in this narration:

The first: Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is *matrūk*.

Ash-Shāfi`ī (d. 204 H.) said: "The books of Al-Wāqidī are lies."[307]

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "The *aḥādīth* of Al-Wāqidī are not to be written. Al-Wāqidī is nothing."[308] And he said: "He is not reliable."[309] And he said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[310] And he said: "Al-Wāqidī used to fabricate *aḥādīth*."[311]

`Alī Ibn al-Madīnī said: "Al-Haytham Ibn `Adī is more reliable in my opinion than Al-Wāqidī. And I am not satisfied with him regarding *aḥādīth*, nor genealogy nor anything."[312] And Al-Haytham Ibn `Adī who he referred to, was declared to be a liar by some, and essentially abandoned by all. I haven't seen anyone who accepted him as a narrator.

Isḥāq Ibn Rāhūyah (d. 238 H.) said: "In my opinion, he (i.e. Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī) is amongst those who fabricate *aḥādīth*."[313]

Ibn Numayr (d. 240 H.) abandoned him.[314]

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal abandoned him[315] and said: "He is a liar."[316] And he said: "I turned his books into book covers long ago."[317] Meaning, due to his narrations being worthless, *Imām* Aḥmad repurposed the books which contained them into covers for other books.

---

[306] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/501
[307] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/21
[308] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/21
[309] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 7/481 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/107
[310] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 7/481
[311] "*Tasmiyat Mashāyikh an-Nasā'ī al-Lathīna Sami`a Minhum*" with "*Thikr al-Mudallisīn*" pg. 76
[312] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/108
[313] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/21
[314] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 1/178
[315] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 1/178
[316] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 7/481 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 4/107
[317] "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 230

Al-Bukhārī said: "They (i.e. the scholars of *ḥadīth*) abandoned him."[318] And he said: "They were silent about him. Aḥmad and Ibn Numayr abandoned him."[319] When Al-Bukhārī says: "They were silent about him", it means they did not narrate *aḥādīth* from him.

And he (i.e. Al-Bukhārī),[320] Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj[321] and An-Nasā'ī[322] said: "*Matrūk* regarding *aḥādīth*."

Al-Jawzajānī said: "He was not convincing."[323]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzī said: "He is *ḍa`īf*." He was asked: "May his *aḥādīth* be written?" He said: "That does not please me, unless it is as a means of *i`tibār*. The people abandoned his *aḥādīth*."[324]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzi said: "He is *matrūk*."[325]

As-Sājī said (d. 307 H.): "He is accused (of lying)."[326]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He narrates *maqlūb* (jumbled) narrations from the reliable narrators and *mu`ḍal* narrations from the well-established narrators, to the point that it may slip into one's heart that he did so intentionally."[327]

Ibn `Adī said: "The texts of the narrations of Al-Wāqidī are not *maḥfūth*. And he is clearly *ḍa`īf*."[328]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "There is a dispute about him. There is clear weakness in his *aḥādīth*."[329]

As for why some scholars said he is reliable, then this can be understood in light of what Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said: "We continued to reject the matter of Al-Wāqidī (i.e. defend him from accusations) until he narrated from Ma`mar from Az-Zuhrī from Nabhān from Umm Salamah from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: *'Are the two of you blind?'*, as he brought something that there is no way to escape. And the *ḥadīth* is the *ḥadīth* of Yūnus; no one else narrated it."[330]

---

[318] "*At-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ*" by Al-Bukhārī 2/311
[319] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" by Al-Bukhārī 1/178
[320] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' aṣ-Ṣaīr*" by Al-Bukhārī pg. 123
[321] "*Al-Kunā Wal-Asmā'"* by Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj 1/499
[322] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 92
[323] "*Aḥwāl ar-Rijāl*" by Al-Jawzajānī pg. 230
[324] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/21
[325] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 8/21
[326] "*Tārīkh Bagdād*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Bagdādī 4/20
[327] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/290
[328] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 7/484
[329] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkūn*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 347
[330] "*Ta`līqāt ad-Dāraquṭnī `Alal-Majrūḥīn Li-Ibn Ḥibbān*" pg. 251 and "*Tārīkh Baḡdād*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Baḡdādī 4/20

Some may have considered him reliable before his mistakes and/or lies became evident, or they may not have known these mistakes and/or lies.

The second: Ṣāliḥ Ibn Ja`far is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable and the only person to narrate from him was Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī.

The third: There is a break in the chain between Muḥammad Ibn Ka`b and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as Muḥammad Ibn Ka`b is from the *tābi`īn*.[331]

2. Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said:

أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ الْحَمِيدِ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ بْنِ الْحَارِثِ حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ اللهِ بْنُ كَعْبِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ قَالَ: قَالَ مُخَيْرِيقٌ يَوْمَ أُحُدٍ: إِنْ أُصِبْتُ فَأَمْوَالِي لِمُحَمَّدٍ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَضَعُهَا حَيْثُ أَرَاهُ اللهُ. وَهِيَ عَامَّةُ صَدَقَاتِ رَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Muḥammad Ibn `Umar informed us: `Abdul-Ḥamīd Ibn Ja`far told me: From Muḥammad Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn al-Ḥārith: `Abdullāh Ibn Ka`b Ibn Mālik told me, saying: "On the Day of Uḥud, Mukhayrīq said: 'If I am killed, then my wealth is for Muḥammad, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, to place wherever Allāh shows him to place it.' And they are all of the charity of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ."[332]

There are three clear defects in this narration:

The first: Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is *matrūk*, as has passed.

The second: There is a dispute regarding `Abdul-Ḥamīd Ibn Ja`far.

Sufyān ath-Thawrī (d. 161 H.) used to attack him[333] and weaken him.[334]

Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-Qaṭṭān weakened him.[335]

---

[331] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā – Al-Qism al-Mutammim Li-Tābi`ī Ahl al-Madīnah Wa Man Ba`dihim*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d pg. 134, "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/251

[332] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/501

[333] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thālith*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 2/338, "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10, "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijal*" by Ibn `Adī 7/3 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/43

[334] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/400, "*Su'ālāt Abī Dāwūd Lil-Imām Aḥmad*" pg. 220, "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thālith*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 2/338, "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10 and "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijal*" by Ibn `Adī 7/3

[335] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijal*" by Ibn `Adī 7/3 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/43

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "*Ṣāliḥ*."[336] And he said: "*Laysa bi-ḥadīthihi ba'*s (There is no harm in his *aḥādīth*)."[337] And he said: "*Laysa bihi ba'*s (There is no harm in him)."[338] And he said: "There is no harm in his *aḥādīth*. He is *ṣāliḥ*."[339] And he said: "He is reliable. There is no harm in him."[340]

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said: "There is no harm in him."[341] And he said: "There is no harm in him. He is reliable."[342] And he said: "There is no harm in him. The people tolerated him." [343]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "His condition is one of truthfulness."[344]

Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī said: "*Thiqah, ḥasan al-ḥadīth*."[345]

An-Nāsā'ī said: "He is not strong."[346]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He possibly made mistakes."[347]

Ibn `Adī said: "And I hope that there is no problem with him. And he is amongst those whose *aḥādīth* may be written."[348]

The third: There is a break in the chain between `Abdullāh Ibn Ka`b Ibn Mālik and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as `Abdullāh Ibn Ka`b Ibn Mālik is from the *tābi`īn*.[349]

3. Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said:

أَخْبَرَنَا محمد بْنُ عُمَرَ: حَدَّثَنِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ بِشْرِ بْنِ حُمَيْدٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ: سَمِعْتُ عُمَرَ بْنَ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ يَقُولُ فِي خِلافَتِهِ بِخُنَاصَرَةَ: سَمِعْتُ بِالْمَدِينَةِ وَالنَّاسُ يَوْمَئِذٍ بِهَا كَثِيرٌ مِنْ مَشْيَخَةِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالأَنْصَارِ أَنَّ حَوَائِطَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ

---

[336] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thālith*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 2/338
[337] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thālith*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 2/338
[338] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr – As-Safar ath-Thālith*" by Ibn Abī Khaythamah 2/337 and "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10
[339] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10
[340] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10
[341] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/43 and "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijal*" by Ibn `Adī 7/3
[342] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10
[343] "*Su'ālāt Abī Dāwūd Lil-Imām Aḥmad*" pg. 220
[344] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 6/10
[345] "*Al-Ma`rifah Wat-Tārīkh*" by Ya`qūb Ibn Sufyān al-Fasawī 2/458
[346] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 72
[347] "*Ath-Thiqāt*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 7/122
[348] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijal*" by Ibn `Adī 7/5
[349] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/52

وَسَلَّمَ يَعْنِي السَّبْعَةَ الَّتِي وَقَفَ مِنْ أَمْوَالِ مُخَيْرِيقٍ وَقَالَ: "إِنْ أُصِبْتُ فَأَمْوَالِي لِمُحَمَّدٍ يَضَعُهَا حَيْثُ أَرَاهُ اللهُ." وَقُتِلَ يَوْمَ أُحُدٍ. فقال رسول الله صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: "مُخَيْرِيقٌ خَيْرُ يَهُودَ."

Muḥammad Ibn `Umar informed us: Muḥammad Ibn Bishr Ibn Ḥumayd told me: On the authority of his father who said: During his *khilāfah*, I heard `Umar Ibn `Abdil-`Azīz in Khunāṣarah saying: "In Al-Madīnah, when the people in it were many, I heard from the *Shaykhs* of the *Muhājirīn* and the *Anṣār* that the walls (i.e. gardens surrounded by walls) of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ – meaning the seven which were designated as *waqf* – were from the wealth of Mukhayrīq. And he said: 'If I am killed, then my wealth is for Muḥammad to place wherever Allāh shows him to place it.' And he was killed on the Day of Uḥud. Then the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: *'Mukhayrīq is the best Jew.'*"[350]

There are three clear defects in this narration:

The first: Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is *matrūk*, as was mentioned earlier.

The second: Muḥammad Ibn Bishr Ibn Ḥumayd is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable, and the only people to narrate from him are Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī and Muḥammad Ibn `Ubayd Ibn `Utbah. And the first is abandoned.

The third: His father – Bishr Ibn Ḥumayd – is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable and the only one to narrate from him is his son.

4. Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said:

أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ أَخْبَرَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدِ بْنِ دِينَارٍ عَنْ أَبِي وَجْزَةَ يَزِيدَ بْنِ عُبَيْدٍ السَّعْدِيِّ قَالَ: كَانَ مُخَيْرِيقٌ أَيْسَرَ بَنِي قَيْنُقَاعَ وَكَانَ مِنْ أَحْبَارِ يَهُودَ وَعُلَمَائِهَا بِالتَّوْرَاةِ. فَخَرَجَ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلم إِلَى أُحُدٍ يَنْصُرُهُ وَهُوَ عَلَى دِينِهِ. فَقَالَ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ مَسْلَمَةَ وَسَلَمَةُ بْنُ سَلَامَةَ: "إِنْ أُصِبْتُ فَأَمْوَالِي إِلَى مُحَمَّدٍ صلّى الله عليه وسلم يَضَعُهَا حَيْثُ أَرَاهُ اللهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ." فَلَمَّا كَانَ يَوْمُ السَّبْتِ وَانْكَسَفَتْ قُرَيْشٌ وَدُفِنَ الْقَتْلَى وُجِدَ مُخَيْرِيقٌ مَقْتُولاً بِهِ جِرَاحٌ فَدُفِنَ نَاحِيَةً مِنْ مَقَابِرِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَلَمْ يُصَلَّ عَلَيْهِ وَلَمْ يُسْمَعْ رَسُولُ اللهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلم يَوْمَئِذٍ وَلَا بَعْدَهُ يَتَرَحَّمُ عَلَيْهِ وَلَمْ يَزِدْهُ عَلَى أَنْ قَالَ: "مُخَيْرِيقٌ خَيْرُ يَهُودَ."

"Muḥammad Ibn `Umar informed us: Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd Ibn Dīnār informed us: On the authority of Abū Wajzah Yazīd Ibn `Ubayd as-Sa`dī who said: "Mukhayrīq was the wealthiest of Banī Qaynuqā` and he was from the rabbis of the Jews and their scholars of the *Tawrāt*. He went out with the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, to Uḥud in support of him, while he remained upon his

[350] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/501

religion (i.e. Judaism). Muḥammad Ibn Maslamah and Salamah Ibn Salāmah said (that he said): 'If I am struck, then my wealth is (to be given) to Muḥammad, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, to place wherever Allāh,عَزَّ وَجَلَّ , shows him to place it.' Then when Saturday came and Quraysh dispersed and those killed were buried, Mukhayrīq was found killed after having been wounded. He was then buried in an area of the Muslim cemetery, yet was not prayed on. And the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, was not heard that day, nor after it, asking for mercy for him. He did not do anything more than say: *'Mukhayrīq is the best Jew.'"* [351]

There are four clear defects in this narration:

The first: Muḥammad Ibn `Umar, who is Al-Wāqidī, is *matrūk*, as was mentioned earlier.

The second: Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd Ibn Dīnār is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable, and Al-Haythamī (d. 807 H.) said: "I do not know him."[352]

The third: There is a break in the chain between Abū Wajzah Yazīd Ibn `Ubayd as-Sa`dī and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as he is a *tābi`ī*.[353]

The fourth: The *ḥadīth* mentions that he was buried in the Muslim cemetery, and this is something that was never done. Ibn Ḥazm said: "The practice of the People of Islām, since the era of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, is that a Muslim is not buried with a polytheist."[354]

And the Jews are polytheists, contrary to what some of the ignorant today claim. Allāh stated:

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عُزَيْرٌ ابْنُ اللهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللهِ ۖ ذَٰلِكَ قَوْلُهُم بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ ۖ يُضَاهِئُونَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِن قَبْلُ ۚ قَاتَلَهُمُ اللهُ ۚ أَنَّىٰ يُؤْفَكُونَ اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِّن دُونِ اللهِ وَالْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ وَمَا أُمِرُوا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا إِلَٰهًا وَاحِدًا ۖ لَّا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

The Jews say: "`Uzayr is the son of Allāh"; and the Christians say: "The *Masīḥ* is the son of Allāh." That is their statement from their mouths; they imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before [them]**. May Allāh destroy them; how are they deluded? They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allāh, and** [also] **the *Masīḥ*, the son of Maryam. And**

---

[351] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/502

[352] "*Majma` az-Zawā'id Wa Manba` al-Fawā'id*" by Al-Haythamī 4/300

[353] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā – Al-Qism al-Mutammim Li-Tābi`ī Ahl al-Madīnah Wa Man Ba`dihim*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d p. 272, "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 2/365, "*Al-Iṣābah Fī Tamyīz aṣ-Ṣaḥābah*" by Ibn Ḥajar al-`Asqalānī 6/563

[354] "*Al-Muḥallā Fī Sharḥ al-Mujallā Bil-Ḥujaji Wal-Āthār*" by Ibn Ḥazm 3/367

they were not commanded except to worship one God; there is no (true) **deity except Him. Exalted is He above whatever they associate with Him.**[355]

5. Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d said:

أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ حَدَّثَنِي أَيُّوبُ بْنُ أَبِي أَيُّوبَ عَنْ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ وَثَّابٍ قَالَ: "مَا هَذِهِ الْحَوَائِطُ إِلَّا مِنْ أَمْوَالِ بَنِي النَّضِيرِ لَقَدْ رَجَعَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلم مِنْ أُحُدٍ فَفَرَّقَ أَمْوَالَ مُخَيْرِيقٍ."

Muḥammad Ibn `Umar informed us: Ayyūb Ibn Abī Ayyūb told me: From `Uthmān Ibn Waṯhāb who said: "These walls (i.e. gardens surrounded by walls) are not but from the wealth of Banī an-Naḍīr. The Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, returned from Uḥud, then divided the wealth of Mukhayrīq."[356]

There are three clear defects in this narration.

The first: Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī is *matrūk*, as was mentioned earlier.

The second: Ayyūb Ibn Abī Ayyūb is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable, and the only person to narrate from him is Muḥammad Ibn `Umar al-Wāqidī.

The third: `Uthmān Ibn Waṯhāb is *majhūl*. No one declared him reliable, and the only person to narrate from him is Ayyūb Ibn Abī Ayyūb.

6. Ibn Shabbah (d. 262 H.) said:

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ بْنُ عِمْرَانَ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللهِ بْنِ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ الْمِسْوَرِ عَنْ أَبِي عَوْنٍ عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ قَالَ: كَانَتْ صَدَقَاتُ رَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَمْوَالاً لِمُخَيْرِيقَ الْيَهُودِيِّ. قَالَ عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ: بَلَغَنِي أَنَّهُ كَانَ مِنْ بَقَايَا بَنِي قَيْنُقَاعَ – ثُمَّ رَجَعَ إِلَى حَدِيثِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ قَالَ: وَأَوْصَى مُخَيْرِيقُ بِأَمْوَالِهِ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَشَهِدَ أُحُداً فَقُتِلَ بِهِ. فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. "مُخَيْرِيقُ سَابِقُ يَهُودَ وَسَلْمَانُ سَابِقُ فَارِسَ وَبِلَالٌ سَابِقُ الْحَبَشَةِ."

Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyā told us, saying: `Abdul-`Azīz Ibn `Imrān told us: From `Abdullāh Ibn Ja`far Ibn al-Miswar: From Abū `Awn: From Ibn Shihāb who said: "The charity of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, was from the wealth of Mukhayrīq the Jew." `Abdul-`Azīz said: "It has reached me that he was from the remnants of Banī Qaynuqā`." Then he returned to the *ḥadīth* of Ibn Shihāb, saying: "And Mukhayrīq bequeathed his wealth to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and he took part in Uḥud, during which he was killed. Then the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

---

[355] *Sūrat at-Tawbah*, 29-30

[356] "*Aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*" by Muḥammad Ibn Sa`d 1/502

'Mukhayrīq is the foremost among the Jews, Salmān is the foremost among the Persians, and Bilāl is the foremost among the Abyssinians.'"[357]

There are three clear defects in the narration:

The first: `Abdul-`Azīz Ibn `Imrān is *matrūk*.

Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He is not reliable. Indeed, he is merely a person of poetry."[358] And he said: "He was a person of genealogy; he was not from the people of *ḥadīth*."[359]

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said: "I have not written anything from him."[360]

Al-Bukhārī said: "His *aḥādīth* are not to be written. He is *munkar al-ḥadīth*."[361]

`Umar Ibn Shabbah said: "And `Abdul-`Azīz made many mistakes because his books burned, so he used to narrate from his memory."[362]

Abū Zur`ah ar-Rāzi refused to read his *aḥādīth* and abandoned narrating from him.[363]

Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī said: "*Matrūk* regarding *aḥādīth*. *Ḍa`īf* regarding *aḥādīth*. Very *munkar* regarding *aḥādīth*." He was asked: "May his *aḥādīth* be written?" He said: "For *i`tibār*."[364]

At-Tirmithī said: "*Ḍa`īf* in *ḥadīth*."[365]

An-Nasā'ī said: "*Matrūk* regarding *aḥādīth*."[366]

Al-`Uqaylī said: "His *aḥādīth* are not *maḥfūth*, and they are not known except through him."[367]

Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He is from amongst those who narrated *munkar* narrations from famous narrators. Then, when he narrated a lot of what did not resemble the *aḥādīth* of those who were

---

[357] "*Tārīkh al-Madīnah*" by Ibn Shabbah 1/173
[358] "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Darimī*" pg. 169, "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/391, "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/500 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/13
[359] "*Tārīkh Baġdād*" by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Baġdādī 12/200
[360] "*Al-`Ilal Wa Ma`rifat ar-Rijāl Li-Aḥmad Riwāyat Ibnihi `Abdillāh*" 3/297, "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/391 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/13
[361] "*At-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*" 6/29 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' aṣ-Ṣaġīr*" pg. 88 both by Al-Bukhārī "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/500 and "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/13 and in "*At-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ*" by Al-Bukhārī 2/257 with just the phrase: "His *Aḥādīth* are not to be written."
[362] "*Tārīkh al-Madīnah*" by Ibn Shabbah 1/123
[363] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/391
[364] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/391
[365] "*Al-Jāmi`*" by At-Tirmithī 2/213
[366] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 72
[367] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' al-Kabīr*" by Al-`Uqaylī 3/13

well-established, he did not deserve to be included amongst the reliable narrators. What he was mainly known for was poetry and literature; not knowledge."[368]

Ibn `Adī, after mentioning one of his *aḥādīth*, said: "And it is *munkar*. And he has other *aḥādīth.* And a number of reliable narrators narrated *aḥādīth* from him, which are not *maḥfūth*."[369]

Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "He is *ḍa`īf*."[370] And he said: "*Ḍa`īf* regarding *aḥādīth*."[371] And he said: "And he is not strong."[372] And he mentioned him in his book of *ḍa`īf* and abandoned narrators.[373]

The second: there is a break in the chain between Ibn Shihāb and the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as Ibn Shihāb, who is Muḥammad Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī, was from the *tābi`īn*.

The third: *Nakārah* (oddity) in the text of the *ḥadīth*. The *ḥadīth* states: *"Mukhayrīq is the foremost among the Jews, Salmān is the foremost among the Persians, and Bilāl is the foremost among the Abyssinians."*

It is well known that Salmān and Bilāl were Muslims. Mukhayrīq was not a Muslim. We also know that there were Jews who entered Islām, such as `Abdullāh Ibn Salām, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

How could two of those mentioned be the best of their people and be Muslims, yet one be the best of his people and not be Muslim, even though there were Muslims from that people?

If all mentioned were people who hadn't entered Islām, this would be fine. Likewise, if no Jews entered Islām, and Mukhayrīq was the closest one to Islām, this would also be fine. However, this is not what was mentioned.

And if one argues that this is not a defect because Mukhayrīq actually did become a Muslim, then the authors' usage of this weak narration falls apart.

The second issue: What the story actually proves

One who looks at these narrations will see that the comparison between that situation and today's reality is a false comparison.

---

[368] "*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*" by Ibn Ḥibbān 2/139
[369] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 6/500
[370] "*As-Sunan*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 5/204
[371] "*Al-`Ilal al-Wāridah Fil-Aḥādīth an-Nabawiyyah*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 1/220
[372] "*As-Sunan*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī 1/43
[373] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkūn*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 281

- Mukhayrīq was in Al-Madīnah after the *Hijrah* of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, meaning he would have had to accept being subject to Islāmic Law and/or agreements pertaining to disbelievers living amongst Muslims.

- He referred to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as the "Messenger of Allāh".

- He fought alongside the Muslims against their enemy.

- He gave up his life fighting against the enemies of the Muslims.

- He bequeathed all of his wealth to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

- He told his companions that his wealth should be given to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, to do with whatever Allāh shows him is best. Meaning he admitted that Allāh was guiding him.

Had these narrations been acceptable, they would prove the glory of Islām in the era of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, more than anything else.

Even when the Prophet ﷺ passed away, he had his armor mortgaged to a Jewish person (*Sahih Bukhari* 2759), a narration that shows he maintained good relations with Jews until his death. As the Qur'an says, "God instructs you to deal kindly and justly with anyone who has not fought you for your faith or driven you out of your homes: God loves the just," (60:8).

This is a false translation of this Verse. The Verse does not say: "God instructs you…" It says: "Allāh Does Not forbid you…"

There is huge a difference between being instructed to do something vs. not being prohibited from doing something. The first would, at the very least, be recommended, if not obligatory. The second would simply be permissible.

I searched seven translations of the Qur'ān in an attempt to see if this mistake could have been taken from someone else, but did not find it in any of those translations.

And a Google search yielded only twenty-two results with this translation: the article in question, or other results which were dated after the release of the article, which in one way or another, are connected to the original in the topics discussed.

According to Al-Tabari, one of the earliest commentators, this verse encourages good relations with "all the sects, creeds, and religions," (*Tafsir al-Tabari* 60:8). These Qur'anic teachings have inspired Muslims throughout the ages. During World War II, the Grand Mosque in Paris rescued

[374] Jews fleeing the Nazis and provided them with a safe haven and means of escape. This is the legacy that Muslims must recall and revive.

In addition to respecting other faiths, Islam prohibits harming others and places great emphasis on Muslims maintaining positive relationships with those outside the faith. The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ issued a stark warning about persecuting others, "Whoever harms a non-Muslim at peace with us will never smell the fragrance of paradise, although its fragrance can be found a distance of forty years of travel," (*Sahih Bukhari* 6516).

This is a blatant mistranslation of the *ḥadīth*. The *ḥadīth* is:

On the authority of `Abdullāh Ibn `Amr, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"مَنْ قَتَلَ نَفْسًا مُعَاهَداً لَمْ يَرَحْ رَائِحَةَ الْجَنَّةِ وَإِنَّ رِيحَهَا يُوجَدُ مِنْ مَسِيرَةِ أَرْبَعِينَ عَامًا."

"Whoever kills a Mu`āhad (i.e. a person who is granted a pledge of security by a Muslim) soul shall not smell the fragrance of Paradise, though its fragrance is found at a distance of forty years (of traveling)."[375]

There is no phrasing in "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" or elsewhere that I have come across with the word *"…harms…"*

Likewise, this is not how it is translated in any of the translations of "*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*" I have come across online or in hard copy.

There is also no way for the word قَتَلَ "*qatala*" to be understood as the word "…harms…"

And far be it from the *sharī`ah* to equate merely harming someone with actually killing them.

On the Day of Judgment, the Prophet himself ﷺ will argue on behalf of persecuted non-Muslims and against the Muslims who persecuted them, "If anyone wrongs a non-Muslim at peace with us, violates his rights, burdens him with more work than he is able to do, or takes something from him without his consent, then I will be his advocate on the Day of Resurrection." (*Sunan Abi Dawud* 3052). This stunning indictment should make any Muslim think twice before hurting anyone.

This *ḥadīth* is *ḍa`īf*.

Abū Dāwūd said:

---

[374] In the original article, the underlined statement contained the following hyperlink: https://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/04/movies/how-a-paris-mosque-sheltered-jews-in-the-holocaust.html

[375] Collected by Ibn Abī Shaybah (#27,947), Aḥmad (#6,745) Al-Bukhārī (#6,914) Al-Bazzār (#2,383)

حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ دَاوُدَ الْمَهْرِيُّ أَخْبَرَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ حَدَّثَنِي أَبُو صَخْرٍ الْمَدِينِيُّ أَنَّ صَفْوَانَ بْنَ سُلَيْمٍ أَخْبَرَهُ عَنْ عِدَّةٍ مِنْ أَبْنَاءِ أَصْحَابِ رَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنْ آبَائِهِمْ دِنْيَةً عَنْ رَسُولِ اللهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ: "أَلَا مَنْ ظَلَمَ مُعَاهِداً أَوْ انْتَقَصَهُ أَوْ كَلَّفَهُ فَوْقَ طَاقَتِهِ أَوْ أَخَذَ مِنْهُ شَيْئًا بِغَيْرِ طِيبِ نَفْسٍ فَأَنَا حَجِيجُهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ."

Sulaymān Ibn Dāwūd al-Mahrī told us: Ibn Wahb informed us: Abū Ṣakhr al-Madīnī told me: That Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym informed him on the authority of a number of sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, on the authority of their fathers who were relatives of each other, that the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: *"Beware, if anyone wrongs a mu`āḥid, diminishes his right, forces him to work beyond his capacity or takes from him anything without his consent, I will be his plaintiff the Day of Resurrection."*[376]

There are four clear defects in this chain.

The first: The sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, are *majhūl*.

There is no mention of any of their names, or the names of their fathers in order to be able to verify their acceptability as narrators. This was mentioned by Al-Munthirī,[377] Al-Munāwī,[378] Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī,[379] and As-Saffārīnī,[380] and it is clear from the fact that none of them are named.

The second: The *tafarrud* of Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym from the numerous sons of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

And in the narration of this *ḥadīth* collected by Al-Bayhaqī (d. 458 H.), it states that the number of these sons were thirty.[381] So, somehow, thirty sons of Companions had this *ḥadīth*, and none of them passed it on to anyone other than this one narrator, and he managed to take it from all thirty? This is despite the fact that there were other major narrators of *ḥadīth* in Al-Madīnah at the time, such as Yaḥyā Ibn Sa`īd al-Anṣārī, Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī, Rabī`ah Ibn `Abdir-Raḥmān, Abuz-Zinād `Abdullāh Ibn Thakwān, `Abdullāh Ibn Yazīd Ibn Hurmuz and others.

The third: There is a dispute about the condition of Abū Ṣakhr al-Madīnī, or Al-Madanī.

---

[376] Collected by Abū Dāwūd (#3,052)
[377] "*At-Targīb Wat-Tarhīb Min al-Ḥadīth ash-Sharīf*" by Al-Munthirī 4/7
[378] "*Kashf al-Manāhij Wat-Tanāqīḥ Fī Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Maṣābīḥ*" by Al-Munāwī 3/437
[379] "*Az-Zawājir `An Iqtirāf al-Kabā'ir*" by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī 2/295
[380] "*Kashf al-Lithām Sharḥ `Umdat al-Aḥkām*" by As-Saffārīnī 7/200
[381] "*As-Sunan al-Kubrā*" by Al-Bayhaqī (#18,731)

He was declared *thiqah* by Al-`Ijlī[382] and Ad-Dāraquṭnī.[383]

However, others gave him a slightly lower grading.

In one narration, Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn said: "He is reliable. There is no harm in him."[384]

Likewise, Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn[385] in one narration, as well as Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal[386] said: "There is no harm in him."

And Ad-Dāraquṭnī said: "Others are more established than him."[387]

And An-Nasā'ī said: "He is not strong."[388]

And further still, he was declared "*ḍa`īf*" by Yaḥyā Ibn Ma`īn[389] in a narration and by An-Nasā'ī.[390]

The fourth: The *tafarrud* of Abū Ṣakhr al-Madīnī from Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym.

This is despite the fact that Ṣafwān Ibn Sulaym had dozens of students who narrated from him, amongst them were major narrators of *ḥadīth*, such as Sufyān ath-Thawrī, Sufyān Ibn `Uyaynah, Mālik Ibn Anas, Al-Fuḍayl Ibn `Iyāḍ, Al-Layth Ibn Sa`d, Ibrāhīm Ibn Sa`d az-Zuhrī, Sulaymān Ibn Mahrān al-A`mash, `Amr Ibn al-Ḥārith al-Anṣārī and others.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī (d. 628 H.) said: "The likes of this may not be authenticated due to the *majhūl* state of those sons."[391]

`Abdul-Muḥsin al-`Abbād said: "Al-Albānī authenticated the *ḥadīth*. And I do not know; were any of these sons made known to him?" And he said: "And the *aḥādīth* of this chapter all have weakness. And they do not reach the level of *ḥasan li-ghayrihi* (good, due to supporting narrations), because the weakness of all of them are extreme."[392]

As for those who accepted it, then they claimed that the number of sons of the Companions made up for them being unknown. However, in fact, this does not help, because, as mentioned earlier, it brings about another problem, which is that somehow, one person, out of all of the

---

[382] "*Ma`rifat ath-Thiqāti Min Rijāl Ahlil-`Ilm Wal-Ḥadīth Wa Min aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wa Thikri Mathāhibihim Wa Akhbārihim*" by Al-`Ijlī 1/323
[383] "*Su'ālāt al-Barqānī Lid-Dāraquṭnī*" pg. 23
[384] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/222
[385] "*Su'ālāt Ibn al-Junayd*" pg. 477 and "*Tārīkh Ibn Ma`īn Riwāyat ad-Dārimī*" pg. 95
[386] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/222
[387] "*Al-Ilzāmāt Wat-Tatabu`*" by Ad-Dāraquṭnī pg. 202
[388] "*Aḍ-Ḍu`afā' Wal-Matrūkīn*" by An-Nasā'ī pg. 33
[389] "*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta`dīl*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim 3/222
[390] "*Al-Kāmil Fī Ḍu`afā' ar-Rijāl*" by Ibn `Adī 3/79
[391] "*Bayān al-Wahm Wal-Īhām al-Wāqi`ayn Fī Kitāb al-Aḥkām*" by Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī 1/599
[392] "*Sharḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*" by `Abdul-Muḥsin al-`Abbād Lesson #255, pg. 23

scholars of Al-Madīnah at the time, took this *ḥadīth* from all of these people - all of whom remained unnamed - yet no one else took this *ḥadīth* from any of them.

Furthermore, none of those who accepted it addressed any of the other issues brought up, other than the *majhūl* state of the sons.

Lastly, the translation provided by the authors is incorrect. The *ḥadīth* states: *"…then I will be his ḥajīj on the Day of Resurrection."* The word "his" refers to the person who wronged someone, not the wronged one. This is because a *ḥajīj* is one who argues or brings proof against someone, not someone who argues on behalf of someone.[393]

Although this is a minor difference, and the resulting meaning is similar, it is, nevertheless, still incorrect, and shows a lack of knowledge of the Arabic language, or at the very least, a lack of attention to detail, on the authors' behalf.

Yaqeen Institute will be releasing a full research paper studying the relationship between Muslims and Jews during the lifetime of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ and during Islamic history soon. Stay tuned!

[393] "*Al-Muyassar Fī Sharḥ Maṣābīḥ as-Sunnah*" by At-Tūribishtī 4/164 and "*`Awn al-Ma`būd `Alā Sharḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*" by Al-`Athīmābādī 8/211

Conclusion

As is evident from the preceding commentary, the article in question contained the following:

- Reliance upon weak, extremely weak and even fabricated narrations
- Attempts to explain away an authentic text in light of these unusable narrations
- Blatant mistranslations of verses of the Qur'ān and *aḥādīth* of the Messenger of Allāh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
- Claims related to jurisprudence which are in contradiction to the consensus of Muslim scholars
- Turning away from *sharī`ah*-based definitions and relying solely upon definitions in the Arabic language
- Picking and choosing which Arabic definitions to use and which to avoid, based upon what suited the goal of the article
- Propagation of the definition of *īmān* according to the deviant sect of the extremist *Murji'ah*

It would have been a bad enough if this was done by a random person on an internet forum. However, this article was a group effort, as it had three authors.

Likewise, it was done on behalf of a "research institute", part of whose mission is "to address relevant topics head-on with the help of the foremost experts in this space." And whose approach includes "making academic grade research material accessible to everyone."[394]

Lastly, each author is listed as having a number of academic credentials and/or position within the Muslim community.[395]

With this in mind, there is no excuse for such low-grade work, and the quality of any work by any of these authors should be called into question.

---

[394] https://yaqeeninstitute.org/en/about-us/our-mission/

[395] https://yaqeeninstitute.org/team/omar-suleiman/; https://yaqeeninstitute.org/team/dr-nazir-khan/; https://yaqeeninstitute.org/team/justin-parrot/

And Allāh knows best.

Abū Ṭālūt Haytham Āl Sayfaddīn